RELIGIOUS TEXTS FROM UGARIT

2nd Edition

N. Wyatt

continuum

Copyrighted material

1st edition published 1998

2nd revised edition
Copyright © 2002 Sheffield Academic Press
A continuum imprint

Continuum International Publishing Group
The Tower Building, 11 York Road, London SE1 7NX
80 Maiden Lane, Suite 704, New York, NY 10038

Reprinted 2006

www.SheffieldAcademicPress.com
www.continuumbooks.com

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording orany information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Typeset by Sheffield Academic Press
Printed and bound in Great Britain by MPG Digital Solutions, Bodmin, Cornwall

ISBN 0-8264-6048-8

CONTENTS

Preface		9
Introduction		11
Abbreviations		25

Part I
KTU 1.1–1.6

THE BAAL CYCLE OF MYTHS		34
KTU 1.1–1.2	Baal and Yam	39
KTU 1.3–1.4	Baal's Palace	70
KTU 1.5–1.6	Baal and Mot	115

Part II
KTU 1.7–1.13

FRAGMENTS AND SHORTER MYTHS CONCERNING BAAL AND ANAT		148
KTU 1.7	Excerpts from KTU 1.3 concerning Anat	148
KTU 1.8	Excerpts from KTU 1.4	152
KTU 1.9	A Fragment of a Myth concerning Baal or his Son	153
KTU 1.10	Baal, the Heifer, and Anat	155
KTU 1.11	A Fragment concerning Baal and Anat	161
KTU 1.12	The Devourers	162
KTU 1.13	A Hymn to Anat	169

Part III
KTU 1.14–1.16

THE STORY OF KING KERET		176

Part IV
KTU 1.17–1.19

THE STORY OF AQHAT 246

Part V
SELECTIONS FROM TEXTS KTU 1.20–1.169

MISCELLANEOUS TEXTS 314
KTU 1.20–1.22 The *RPUM* Texts 314
KTU 1.23 The Gracious Gods: A Sacred Marriage Liturgy 324
KTU 1.24 The Wedding of Nikkal and Ib 336
KTU 1.40 A Liturgy for a Rite of Atonement for the People of Ugarit 342
KTU 1.41 Instructions for the Ritual Calendar of the Month of Vintage 348
KTU 1.87 Duplicate of KTU 1.41: The Variant Ending 356
KTU 1.43 Sacrifices and Votive Gifts in Palace Rituals 357
KTU 1.47, 1.118 and RS 20.24 Pantheon Lists 360
KTU 1.65 A Prayer for the Security of Ugarit 363
KTU 1.78 An Astronomical Text 366
KTU 1.83 A Goddess Confronts a Dragon 368
KTU 1.92 The Myth of Athtart the Huntress 370
KTU 1.96 A Spell against the Evil Eye 375
KTU 1.100 The Myth of Shapsh and the Mare: A Spell against Snakebite 378
KTU 1.101 A Hymn to Baal Enthroned 388
KTU 1.107 A Cautionary Tale: Širuġazuz Learns the Risks of Snake-Charming 391
KTU 1.108 An Intercessory Prayer to Rapiu and other Deities 395
KTU 1.113 A Royal Liturgy, and the Ugaritic King-List 399
KTU 1.114 The Myth of El's Banquet: A Medical Text 404
KTU 1.117 The Plea for a House for Baal 414

KTU 1.119	The Ritual Calendar for the Month of Ibaalat and Another Month and a Prayer for Ugarit Under Siege	416
KTU 1.124	A Medical Text based on an Oracle Tradition	423
KTU 1.133	A Mythological Fragment concerning Mot	426
KTU 1.148	A Compendium of Ritual Lists	427
KTU 1.161	A Royal Funeral Liturgy	430
KTU 1.169	An Incantation for the Exorcism of a Possessed Adolescent	442

Bibliography 450
Index of References 486
Index of Authors 496

PREFACE

The present work offers translations with commentary of fifty tablets[1] from Ugarit. I had hoped that before it was complete I would have access to the new texts currently (1997) in press, in particular wishing to include the new Ilimilku text (RS 1992.2016) and other recent discoveries. Unfortunately, though Pierre Bordreuil kindly arranged for me to see the proofs of the publication they have not arrived in time to be included here. I hope that I shall be able to offer a second volume at a later date.

A work of this kind is essentially a cooperative venture. Any translator of ancient texts apart from the first will rely heavily on his colleagues, and build on their earlier efforts. I hope that my voluminous footnotes leave no conscious debts unacknowledged. My brief from Sheffield Academic Press was to justify my translations where they differ from others, and to present a short commentary, in the notes accompanying the text. At times it seems as though these have run away with the enterprise, when they exceed the amount of translated text on the page. The need for brevity has however controlled the enterprise from the beginning. Thus the reader will not find exhaustive treatment of every issue, but representative examples of the main points of disagreement among scholars, both philological and text-critical on the one hand, and hermeneutical and exegetical on the other. I hope that on the scale from dull pedantry to readability, both in translation and annotation, I have approximated to the latter end of the range, and that this has not been too much at the expense of accuracy and faithfulness to the original.

Ugaritologists will lament the appearance of yet a further edition of the Ugaritic texts, in parallel with the continued comparative neglect of the Akkadian and Hurrian texts from Ras Shamra, which are equally deserving of a wider dissemination than the specialist periodicals. My

1. KTU 1.2 iii is treated separately, and one Akkadian text (RS 20.24) is included among the pantheon lists.

own professional concern with Religious Studies teaching has made my involvement with the present repertoire a labour of love. But I know my limitations. It is also the case that in terms of the academic effort devoted to Ugaritic studies, the overwhelming proportion has been on the part of biblical scholars, theologians and religious studies specialists. What may with some justice be considered a disproportionate emphasis is therefore simply a fact of life. It is the primarily religious texts from Ugarit which are bound to stimulate the greatest interest and attention.

A few people deserve special thanks. First among these is Wilfred Watson, who not only read the text at various stages of its composition, but pointed me to numerous further references, and enabled me to provide more substantial justification for my own position in a number of cases. At times he corrected my wilder speculations, while at others he encouraged me in the presentation of a new point of view. Peter Hayman has also been immensely encouraging, offering a number of useful criticisms and observations. Graeme Auld, Annie Caubet, Pierre Bordreuil, John Gibson, Jean-Marie Husser, Ted Lewis, Jeffery Lloyd, Dennis Pardee, Hédwige Rouillard-Bonraisin, Steve Wiggins, and Marguerite Yon should also be mentioned with gratitude for their continuing encouragement, supply of unsolicited offprints and hospitality. It goes without saying that my wife Betty is owed an incalculable debt for her patience and encouragement, for my academic colleagues will appreciate only too well the burdens I am likely to have placed on her through the shortcomings of the twenty-five hour day. She feels that she has lived with my beloved Canaanites for years, and all she wants to do now is get away to the Pyrenees!

For the second edition I have made a number of minor corrections, included four translation changes of substance, and incorporated some recent bibliography. I have kept additional annotation to the minimum.

N. Wyatt
New College
Edinburgh
August 2001

INTRODUCTION

For a couple of centuries archaeologists have been painstakingly digging away among the many ancient mounds of the Near East, and startling the world with their discovery of spectacular treasures, such as the royal graves at Ur, the alleged (but spurious) walls of Jericho from Joshua's time, the Dead Sea Scrolls from Qumran and the tomb of Tutankhamun.

Discoveries such as these have stimulated the lay imagination to a remarkable extent. Less spectacular is an equally painstaking and detailed endeavour carried on seasonally at important sites, and throughout the year in universities and museums, analysing the more down-to-earth but more representative survivals from the past: ancient pots, broken walls, twisted scraps of metal, and above all, from the drier parts of the region, papyri and clay tablets.

Clay was a universal medium for writing throughout Mesopotamia, and for a shorter period in the second millennium in parts of Anatolia, Syria and Egypt (as witness the Amarna letters, and archives from Ebla, Hattusas, Alalakh and Ugarit). A sharpened reed could easily impress early forms of writing, known as cuneiform from its wedge-shaped impressions (Latin *cuneus*, a wedge) upon a damp lump, which when fired in the kiln gave a permanent (and unfalsifiable) record. Writing developed initially from pictographs, which illustrated the commodities, livestock or persons with which the earliest records were concerned. Pictographic writing is found in Egypt and Mesopotamia from a very early period. But it could be developed in interesting ways, for instance by the use of the phonetic values of the things portrayed to denote the same phonetic value in other contexts. Writing developed quite differently in Egypt and Mesopotamia. In the former land, the pictographic system developed in fits and starts, always maintaining its 'hieroglyphic' character, since its use in monumental contexts such as tomb inscriptions became as much a work of art as of recording sacred texts. The development of flattened papyrus stalks into a kind of paper

led to the use of reed and quill pens and ink, and this different medium allowed three media for writing in Egypt: the fully-developed hieroglyphic script continued in use for important documents, a cursive, called hieratic, developed for more routine use, and a late development, demotic, continued down into the common era.

In Mesopotamia, the earliest writing was developed, using clay and stylus as the means, to record the ancient language Sumerian. As in Egypt, it was pictographic in origin, but the character of the medium led to an increasing stylisation and abstraction, as pictures were developed into conventional arrangements of wedges whose similarity to the original pictures grew ever more tenuous. The outcome was a complex system of ideograms and syllabic signs, which grew more remote from its origins in being adapted to record an unrelated language, Akkadian (the umbrella term for the Semitic languages Babylonian and Assyrian). In being written syllabically, Akkadian was cumbersome. It meant that a student scribe had to learn hundreds of signs denoting all possible permutations of consonants and vowels, together with considerable numbers of surviving ideograms, determinatives and other scribal aids. But as a medium it was of great use to us, because it has now, through the work of archaeologists, left us with a rich treasure of literature, in addition to the more mundane but very useful documents illustrating features of everyday life. Writing opens the door to history, in its sense of a record of the past, and our knowledge of the history of the region grows apace.

The region of western Syria and Palestine never formed a cultural or political unity, as happened with the surrounding areas. Egypt to the south, Anatolia to the north, and Mesopotamia to the east, for all their vicissitudes, formed coherent blocks which periodically interfered with, dominated and ravaged Syria, the dispensible periphery, the buffer zone, to the great powers. Because they never formed a great empire, the peoples of Syria do not at first glance have the same prestige for the modern surveyor of the scene. And yet they bequeathed perhaps the most important of all cultural forms to subsequent history, alphabetic writing.

The history of the alphabet is complex, both inherently, in that different experiments were being tried at various times and places, and because of the scantiness of the surviving record. The Egyptians developed an alphabet by the time of unification (*ca* 3100 BCE), but it remained embedded in a welter of ideographic, polyconsonantal and

determinative forms. Proto-Sinaitic, a script found in Egyptian industrial workings of the second millennium in the Sinai, adapted these forms in a primitive way to inscriptions in a Semitic language, and is often credited as the primary source of the later Phoenician script which, by way of Greek and Roman adoption and adaptation, formed our modern western alphabet. But to the north an intriguing experiment was being tried in the middle of the second millennium on the Syrian coast. The technique of cuneiform writing was adapted to an early cross between a much simplified syllabary and an alphabet.[1] It made do with only thirty signs, each generally used to represent a consonant with a following vowel. Except for the guttural aleph, which had three forms distinguishing three following vowels, none of the vowels was specified, but was to be understood from the context, as in modern Hebrew or Arabic. In effect it was an alphabet. This 'alphabetic cuneiform' is not itself a direct ancestor of later alphabets, being an adaptation to cuneiform technology of the so-called 'Proto-Canaanite' scripts, themselves related to the Proto-Sinaitic script, but its development was certainly part of the intellectual process. While short inscriptions in alphabetic cuneiform have been found from scattered sites in the Levant as far south as Beth Shemesh, the overwhelming bulk of the tablets so far discovered come from Tell Ras Shamra, the site of the ancient city of Ugarit.

Ugarit was one of many cities from the ancient world which lived on as a remote memory in other ancient texts discovered by archaeologists, but which no one expected to rediscover. A farmer ploughing his field near the tell at Ras Shamra, on the Syrian coast, in 1928, dislodged with his ploughshare the top of a stone-built tomb which turned out upon inspection to be of Mycenaean type. That is, it pointed to the cultural pattern known to us from the Mycenaean Greeks. A French archaeological team under the initial direction of Claude Schaeffer began excavations, which apart from the war years have continued ever since. Tablets were discovered in the first season and deciphered by two scholars independently—Hans Bauer and Charles Virolleaud—with great rapidity. What has emerged over the following decades is a perfect microcosm of ancient Mediterranean culture. The origins of human settlement on the site date back as far as the sixth millennium, but its heyday was in the Late Bronze Age (*ca* 1550–1200 BCE), from which

1. On the debate between 'alphabet' and 'syllabary' in the early simplified writing systems see Swiggers (1984).

period all the writings so far discovered are to be dated. These are in no less than seven languages[2]—Akkadian, Cypro-Minoan, Egyptian, Hittite (both hieroglyphic and cuneiform), Hurrian, Sumerian, and Ugaritic, the last language hitherto unknown, but turning out to be indirectly related to early Hebrew. Here we are evidently in contact with one of the great international cities of the day, with diplomatic and commercial contacts stretching vast distances, and through the discovery of texts, the corpus of surviving Canaanite (later Phoenician) writings has more than doubled.

Many of the tablets from Ugarit are unromantic trade lists, lists of personnel, for tax or levy purposes, diplomatic and personal letters, and these contribute to our understanding of the management of daily life, the social and economic structure, political events and so forth. One curious flurry of letters in Akkadian reveals a court scandal, in which a queen has apparently been caught *in flagranti delicto* and is sent packing, which may have ended up with the queen being thrown into the sea.

The religious texts from Ugarit are of particular importance. Many of them are humdrum enough: they merely list how many sheep or oxen are to be sacrificed on which days of the month to which deities. But others reveal the inner life of the people. In Akkadian are a number of compositions belonging to the 'wisdom' genre, familiar to readers of the Hebrew Bible in Job or Proverbs. In Ugaritic there is a group of mythological texts relating the fortunes of Baal, the storm-god, two stories (folktales may be the least controversial designation) relating to King Keret and Aqhat son of Danel, and a number of shorter compositions of a mythological, ritual, hymnodic or composite character. While these do not immediately betray the personal foibles or cares of their authors, they are invaluable in our attempts to probe into the real concerns of the people of Ugarit. What kind of religious experience did they have? What did they understand their myths to be saying? Were the folktales ever more than just good stories? These questions have provoked lively discussion among scholars, and many of these issues are nowhere near resolution.

Apart from continuing discussion on the genre of the various texts, there are the problems of translation. Some while ago (November 1992) I heard a speaker on BBC Radio 4's 'Farming Today' state that 'an art is a science with more than seven variables'. When we turn to Ugaritic

2. 'Nine languages and/or writing systems': Pardee (1997b: 264).

poetry perhaps we may suggest that translation is an art with more than seven variables. The variables which are in operation in the present undertaking are the following:

1. What is written on the tablet? That is, what do *I*, the individual trying to make sense of it, think is written on the tablet?
2. What do other scholars say is written on the tablet?
3. Is what is written on the tablet a correct text, or has the scribe made any of the usual errors (simply misspelling,[3] such as by mishearing a guttural, dental or sibilant, miswriting his letter by adding too many strokes or writing too few, omitting a consonant or whole word, misremembering the fixed sequence of a formula, or practising homoioarchton, homoioteleuton, haplography or dittography)?
4. Once we have established a consonantal text, sometimes having to make a choice between two or more reasonable possibilities, are there too many word-dividers, too few, or are any displaced or misread (e.g. has a large one been confused with *g* or ')?
5. What are we to do with gaps in the text? Determination of how many letters are missing in a given lacuna will obviously have a bearing on the mutual relation of those words which survive on either side of a gap. Are we, moreover, to adopt a minimalist, a maximalist or a middle-of-the-road strategy with regard to reconstruction?
6. Once we have established an agreed text, perhaps with a little cautious reconstruction according to minimalist criteria, and with isolation of each word, what are we to make of the vocalization problem, given that we do not know how Ugaritic was pronounced, despite the apparent confidence of some of our peers, and that for any group of say, three consonants the arrangement can involve variables on two levels, firstly the sequence (cvcvc, cvcvcv, cvccv, and rarely ccvcvc where the first consonant may carry *š^{e}wa*, e.g. Heb. *krētîm* or *k^{e}rētîm*), and secondly all the possible range of vowels that can fit into this pattern?

3. Richardson (1973: 3) estimates that in KTU 1.6 between 3 and 4% of the words are spelt wrongly, 'a disturbingly large percentage'.

7. At a third level how are we to identify the part of speech on the basis of decisions at level 6, which will determine the syntax of the sentence?
8. Again, once individual words have been isolated, how are we to translate them? Do we presuppose a northwest Semitic basis (which will involve Aramaic, Phoenician and Hebrew cognates)? When do we turn instead to Akkadian, and even, for purposes of comparison, to Egyptian, Ethiopic, Epigraphic South Arabian, or Arabic, Mycenaean Greek, Hittite, or even Sanskrit?
9. The bulk of the material treated in this anthology is in poetry. What weight then are we to give to prosodic factors, which have a bearing on syntax, the grouping of words, the sense of words and so on, and in what degree is this process to be carried on in reverse?
10. Though all scholars fight for their integrity and independence, there is nevertheless a convention that previous scholarship is taken into account. Thus a dialectic is established between all previous work and each new contribution, and the proponent of a new view is obliged by academic etiquette to justify departure from agreed principles or results that have achieved a consensus. The range of views entertained by one's colleagues, past and present, can be quite startling, as perusal of some of the footnotes will show. How is one to sift the claims and counter-claims? Should one be bold (even bloody, bold and resolute!) or always err on the side of caution?
11. New discoveries continually turn up new evidence which has to be taken into account, on the linguistic, literary and archaeological levels, and the discipline of Ugaritic studies itself is in a dialectical relationship with Assyriology, Hittitology, Egyptology, Aegean and biblical studies. Some publications appearing during the preparation of this study have involved modifying my comments, changing my position and at times altering the translation.

Without wishing to labour the point, I think I have shown that we have gone beyond art, with at least eleven variables! To all the disciplinary skills required, we have to add the new translator's own intuition, and in any work that pretends to serious scholarship, a balance between the minutiae of all the philological and other technical issues outlined

above, and a concern for readable English. (That makes thirteen variables!) And no doubt the list could be extended. Too many translations are the work of specialists who in straining to be faithful to the ancient original, torture the language of translation most painfully. This is not a charge I would lay against any of the main contributions to Ugaritic translation work which are cited extensively in the following pages, though some curious infelicities have occasionally arisen. But the idiomatic and stylistic demands of two languages from different families can frequently be hard to reconcile.

At any level of operation each of these factors is having a direct influence on all the other factors, and at times it is a matter of juggling with so many balls in the air at once that it is a daunting task indeed to dare to pronounce anything new, and yet one hesitates to follow the consensus. Intuition remains the final arbiter.

These compositions, apart from the sacrificial lists, are written in verse. Many of the technicalities of Ugaritic prosody still elude scholars, but the most striking feature is also the one most familiar to readers of the Hebrew Bible: the use of 'parallelism', in which the content of one line (or colon) is repeated or developed in slightly different words in a second or more lines, forming double, triple or larger units (bicola, tricola and so on). In translation it is impossible to recapture the subtleties of style which use the possibilities of traditional forms such as these. Alliteration is used to great effect, word-order is very fluid (not quite as confusing as Horace) and is deliberately used to achieve chiastic patterns, or to reserve a key word for use as a climax. While scholars frequently have great difficulty deciding which of several cognate words is being used in a given context, it is often evident that the poets are deliberately punning, or playing on phonetic or semantic associations.

One of the features of the northwest Semitic language group, to which Ugaritic belongs (along with Hebrew, Aramaic, Phoenician, etc.), is the way in which the language builds on basic lexemes, commonly of a triconsonantal form, and then attaches various prefixes or suffixes (or both) to build up the particular word in context. The lack of vowels in Ugaritic, apart from those attached to the guttural aleph, constitutes a problem for the translator. Thus, taking the lexical element *mlk* as an example (meaning as a noun 'king' and as a verb 'rule'), the simple form *mlk* may be translated, according to context, as 'to rule' (infinitive), 'rule!' (imperative, masculine or feminine singular or

plural), 'he rules' (indicative 'qatala' form) or 'king' or 'kingship' (nouns). The form *mlkt* allows even greater variety: as a noun it means 'queen'. As a verb it means 'I rule', 'you rule', 'she rules' (all singular), 'they both rule' (feminine dual), all indicative 'qatala' form. So these two forms may be translated in thirteen different ways. Another example is the form *l*, which is generally prefixed to nouns and verbs, and may be translated as 'to' or 'from' (opposites), 'for' or 'concerning' (all attached to a noun), 'indeed' or 'not' (opposites, attached to a verb), or 'O' (vocative), that is seven meanings for one form, some mutually antonymous. I speak of 'form' rather than 'word', because while at times one word may have various meanings (polysemy), at others we undoubtedly have different words which look the same (homonymy), and which may or may not have sounded the same (homophony). These are just some of the reasons why scholars have frequently come up with radically different meanings for the same Ugaritic text. This is by no means a problem peculiar to Ugaritic, but it is compounded in this case by the quantity of unknowns surrounding the whole enterprise of interpreting Ugaritic culture. The incautious reader may be forgiven for thinking that when ten scholars have ten different views on a passage, none of them really knows what they are talking about. The reality is that it is often a wonder that any sense at all, however provisional, may be gleaned from so unpromising a starting-point. But scholarship is a cooperative and cumulative enterprise, and little by little, over the decades, a measure of consensus develops at least with regard to the less controversial passages.

Readers who consult other translations of the Ugaritic texts may be surprised and perhaps disturbed to find wide variations in interpretation of important passages, resulting in significantly different bases for overall interpretation. There are usually good reasons for this, because of the sheer obscurity of the material. We can enunciate a few basic rules which are all the more important because of the intractability of the material. A translation which simply makes nonsense in general or nonsense within the context cannot be right. A translation which ignores the demands of the literary genre cannot be right. If we are dealing with poetry, then a translation which fits the appropriate prosodic canons is more likely to be right than one which, however elegant, ignores them. Our problem in the case of Ugaritic poetry is that while we can to a considerable extent determine its canons and methods of construction, many features continue to evade us. As with the closely

related forms of biblical Hebrew poetry, we still cannot be certain whether metre determines form, and if so how it is measured. Some count syllables, others stresses, yet others words. Sense units (cola) may occur in isolation (monocola), but are more commonly set together, as we have noted, in pairs (bicola), triads (tricola), quatrains (tetracola) or even pentads (pentacola).[4] At times there is room for legitimate differences of opinion about how a given text should be analysed. There is an element of subjective judgment in this. If a translator takes a particular line, it is not that he insists that other views are wrong, but rather that of many possibilities, one strikes him as the most compelling. Sometimes it is just an intuition which is only afterwards justified in technical terms. In many cases, a choice must be made between competing and equally compelling possibilities.

Apart from all the linguistic difficulties facing translators, there is the question of the condition of the tablets. As can be seen below, there are often huge lumps missing, so that fifty or so lines of verse may be missing between two surviving sections. Even if a tablet looks superficially quite promising, a damaged surface may often leave considerable portions of text tantalisingly irrecoverable, or leave the way open for reconstruction and restoration, but at the same time offer obvious pitfalls to the unwary. Tablet 5 of the Baal series (KTU 1.5), for example, with about half completely missing, is extremely frustrating. Some of it reads with great clarity, but a portion of the surface is crazed so that some ghosts of letters peek out just below the threshold of legibility. It is tempting to propose readings in such circumstances, and often hard to acknowledge that discretion is the better part of scholarship. We face a similar problem with KTU 1.16, the third tablet of the Keret story. While much of col. i, for instance, may be read with relative ease, the surface of col. iii is pitted, cracked and crazed, making it a decipherer's nightmare. There is therefore not even unanimity of view on the text to be read, before we even begin the difficult task of making sense of it. In such a pass, it is to be wondered that scholars can even obtain sense, not that different opinions are held. With tablet KTU 1.19 i in the Aqhat story, it does not really matter whether the text is damaged or not, because scholars can still not agree what to make of it. There are as many interpretations as there are studies. This should not result in

4. A rare instance of a heptacolon is found in KTU 1.6 ii 31-35 and v 12-19 (each instance being used to restore damage in the other). The sevenfold structure draws on the symbolic value of the number seven, which represents totality.

counsels of despair, however. It simply warns us that on occasion there are limits to our tentative reconstructions of the past.

The reader may note the apparent confidence with which large sections of missing text can be restored, particularly in the longer narrative poems. This is not merely the subjective whim of translators, though some are prone to be more eager than cautious in their desire to fill in the gaps. It is evident that the poetry relies heavily on stereotyped formulae, so that some restoration is to be undertaken with some confidence. But a contentious issue is the value in offering translations of texts of which an entire half-column is missing, which do not betray evidence of such repeated formulae. Some scholars have attempted reconstructions of such passages, while others have with less justification tried to build theories of interpretation upon such conjectural enterprises. But except in a few cases where we can recognize a well-known sequence because it occurs elsewhere, the attempt at wholesale reconstruction is in my view a misleading policy, and we should learn to be content with what we have, however frustrating it is. This is not to rule conjecture out of court, but any tentative proposal must be acknowledged as such, and not paraded as entirely obvious. Many conjectures in the past have been vindicated by subsequent discoveries.

The repeated use of stock expressions is everywhere evident. Thus a character never opens his mouth in the Baal myths, but he 'lifts up his voice and cries'. Dialogue seems always to be shouted *à pleine gorge*, as though we are to envisage a dramatized version of events, in which, like the victims of a Racine tragedy, all declaim their lines so that the very gods may hear. Perhaps the gods are deaf! Whenever the gods meet together, they sit down to a feast, and the menu is generally described according to a set of stock phrases. It can be seen that this highly repetitious language does not merely copy previous accounts *verbatim* every time; there is scope for the poet to extend or curtail conventional phrases, to reverse the order of lines, to juxtapose stock phrases which elsewhere occur separately.[5] And while it is difficult to appreciate this in translation, we may imagine the poet's audience reacting with pleasure to his skill in ringing the changes of a traditional form. For this poetry is essentially oral, and bears all the hallmarks of oral literature (though some of the scribal errors that occur are of such a

5. At times the lack of conformity to a normative formula leads to no evident poetic variation, but results instead in a *non-sequitur*, and the translator is obliged to make appropriate corrections.

kind as to suggest that the surviving tablets were copied from previous manuscripts). The poet would have the bare bones of a plot, and a considerable store of fixed phrases, above all of fixed word-pairs (it is surprizing how much of this repertoire is shared with biblical poetry), and his particular virtuosity lay in unexpected combinations, in the clever use of alliteration, in the choice of the metre appropriate to the immediate context, and probably too in the skill with which he drew new meanings out of the old themes.

For we should not view the ancient poets as merely reciting old lays without variation, faithful to the last jot to a fixed, unchanging lore. If we consider the three long compositions, the cycle of Baal myths (KTU 1.1–1.6), Keret (KTU 1.14–1.16) and Aqhat (KTU 1.17–1.19), all attest the role of Ilimilku the scribe (colophons at the end of KTU 1.4 viii, 6 vi, 16 vi and 17 vi). It is probable that tablets 1–3, 5, 14, 15, 18 and 19 also had such notes of authorship. A further fragment bearing Ilimilku's name has recently been discovered (RS 1992.2016). Such a departure from the conventional anonymity of ancient literature is quite remarkable, though by no means unparalleled. No biblical book before Ecclesiasticus, written in the early second century BCE by Jesus ben Sira, is credited with an author, except by later editorial tradition. The most interesting of the notes concerning Ilimilku occurs at KTU 1.6 vi 54-58. The titles in the last line belong to King Niqmad (II). It is not clear whether the other titles are those of Ilimilku or Attanu, though probably of the latter.[6] It is also not clear whether Ilimilku is merely the amanuensis of Attanu, who among his other accomplishments and offices is also a poet of some repute, or whether Ilimilku himself is the poet, authorised or indeed commissioned by Attanu. Perhaps as the latter's student, Ilimilku is here stretching his own wings in composition, and with all the diffidence of the budding artist, acknowledges his debt to his master. This is speculation. It has even been suggested that far from merely passing on conventional ideas, Ilimilku (or Attanu through him)

6. Thus Pardee (1997c: 273 n. 283). Hallo (1997) arrived after the present study was complete. I have been through the relevant texts (Fleming 1997; Levine, de Tarragon and Robertson 1997a, 1997b; Pardee 1997c; Younger 1997) to incorporate observations where they complement or differ from my own. Pardee (1997d: 376 n. 2) notes that 'it is becoming increasingly clear that most Ugaritic texts are from the late thirteenth century', referring to forthcoming work by A.S. Dalix. Pierre Bordreuil has said the same (SBL paper, San Francisco, November 1997). Unfortunately, we need to see the evidence before we can offer an evaluation. (See now p. 146 n. 132.)

is challenging them and reflecting an age of considerable political, religious and intellectual turmoil.

We are probably justified in supposing that in the exercise of the skills of a poet, the ancient composer had a position of enormous authority in ancient Ugarit, as did the prophets, really poets, in ancient Israel and Judah, or Homer in Greece. Such men, driven by muses, who were implicitly supernatural voices 'giving' the words which the poets declaimed, and occasionally wrote down, were in effect the theologians of their age. With whatever freedom the poet spoke or sang, his words were words of authority. Indeed, the only way in which the gods could talk was through the intermediary and interpretative mouths of their skilled agents. Individual poets may have contributed not a little to the shaping of the cosmology of their day, and also to changing it. Like O'Shaughnessy's poets, they were indeed the movers and shakers of the world.

For the general reader, the texts from Ugarit have three main claims to attention. Firstly, they open up one further vista in the slowly unfolding world of the ancient Near East, gradually and tentatively rolling back the frontier of prehistory as the archaeological skeleton is fleshed out with the echoes of the song and laughter of real people, no longer merely cultural ciphers (or worse still MB IIA or LB III), but individuals like Ilimilku the scribe, or the childless King Arhalbu. While Keret and Danel are, for all we know, merely literary figures, the descriptions of their emotions are not foreign to us, and reveal constants in the moral life of humanity. Secondly, we have in Ugaritic culture a direct link with Greek origins of the Mycenaean era. Indeed all the evidence suggests that before the time of Alexander contact between the Semitic and Greek worlds was very largely in a westward direction, certainly as far as areas outside the Ionian coastline were concerned. Many deities and heroes familiar to us from Greek mythology have transparent Semitic antecedents, and we meet in these the prototypes of Apollo, Andromeda, Bellerophon, Dionysus, Actaeon and Perseus, and a host of lesser figures. Thirdly, although Ugarit was destroyed *ca* 1200–1190 BCE, and the states of Israel and Judah probably arose nearly two centuries later according to current chronological convention, the linguistic and literary connections between the two areas is considerable. Indeed it is precisely the connections between the two which have inspired much of the scholarly effort devoted to Ugaritic studies. The language is generally learnt by postgraduate students with degrees in Theology

and a primary research interest in the Hebrew Bible. A knowledge of classical Hebrew is the usual course prerequisite. And in spite of the efforts of some of the ancient editors of the biblical tradition, faithfully echoed in the efforts of some of their modern counterparts, we discern the old Canaanite gods at every turn, either as rivals to Yahweh, or as contributors to the mythology used to articulate the Hebrew experience of the transcendent. Ugaritic culture, more than any other single force in the ancient world, is now generally recognized as a vital component in the cultural matrix in which Jewish, and after it Christian, thought first took shape. It therefore plays an integral part in the broad framework of European culture, which has been so profoundly influenced by these traditions.

The texts here translated are in the order in which they appear in *KTU*[2], except for the rearrangement of those pieces attributed to KTU 1.2, the reversal of the column-order in KTU 1.22 and the inclusion of KTU 1.87 immediately after KTU 1.41, with estimated gaps allowed for. The commentary element in this edition is kept to a minimum. A bald translation is of limited use to the student seeking to make sense of texts that are at times very strange to the modern reader. On the other hand, the amount of debate generated is already voluminous, and certain of the larger works are already the subject of large commentary volumes on the biblical pattern (Margalit 1989a, 1995; M.S. Smith 1994). The comments are intended to provide a basic orientation, with references to further reading. As for philological notes, my brief from the publisher has been essentially to justify my translation when it differed from others. But as anyone will discover on following up the footnotes, where there is disagreement it is often universal. To cite every authority would be tedious. My coverage has been most complete with the lesser known texts, and I have generally favoured recent discussion over older work when forced to make a choice on grounds of space.

This edition of the texts has already expanded considerably beyond my original brief from Sheffield Academic Press, nearly tripling in size. I have therefore kept bibliographical references to a minimum. Many more authorities could have been cited, and readers will find many further references in the sources to which I refer. To my critics I concede that some of my sins of omission are deliberate. My debt to all my colleagues in Ugaritic studies will be evident at every turn, for translation is essentially a collective enterprise. I am happy to acknowledge the

debt, and hope that I have offended none by misrepresentation. It goes without saying that any errors of judgment are my own. Offer a fat ram to Baal on my behalf!

A note on translation conventions: I have attempted to give a fluent English version, which at times means translating the Ugaritic idiom into an English one. Where this threatens to misrepresent the Ugaritic I have explained it in a footnote. The following signs are used: words in English which correspond to no Ugaritic word but which are necessary for good English are given in parenthesis: (...). Words which parallel instances of formulaic usage lead us to expect in the Ugaritic, but which for no obvious good reason are missing, so that it can be laid at the door of scribal error, are shown thus: <...>, and other small-scale omissions, such as the odd letter from a word, are similarly treated. Missing text, which can with reasonable confidence be restored on the basis of parallel usage in other texts, is bracketed thus: [...]. I have avoided too great a freedom with regard to reconstruction of missing text. A small exclamation mark in Ugaritic words indicates instances where individual letters may be read as scribal errors, for example, *lbd*ˡ*m* for *lbum*. When it is tempting to restore a given word, but certainty is simply impossible, the word is followed by a small question mark, for example, Saphon?. The same sign is used in instances of hesitant translation. The brackets {...} are used to identify text which I believe should be omitted, as in instances of dittography.

All references to line numbers are to the KTU numbering system. Since I have given numbers only for every fifth line, where the marginal number identifies the line of the translation in the course of which the Ugaritic text-line begins, it may at times appear imprecise. But I take it that those following up discussion of translational nuances will be working with, hopefully, *KTU*^{2} to hand, so that identifying text should be relatively easy. Footnotes appear on both sides of punctuation marks. The principle I have observed is to put notes to individual words immediately following them. Those following punctuation marks deal with the entire preceding colon or bi- (tri-)colon.

ABBREVIATIONS

AAAS	*Annales archéologiques arabes syriennes*
AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	David Noel Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York: Doubleday, 1992)
AbrN	*Abr-Nahrain*
ACF	Annuaire du Collège de France
AcOr (Hung.)	*Acta orientalia academiae scientiarum hungaricae*
AF	*Anuari de filologia*
AfO	*Archiv für Orientforschung*
AHw	W. Von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1965)
AION	*Annali dell'istituto orientale di Napoli*
AIONS	*Annali dell'istituto orientale di Napoli*, Supplements
AJBA	*Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology*
ALASP	Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt–Syrien–Palästinas und Mesopotamiens
ALBO	Analecta lovaniensia biblica et orientalia
ANET	James B. Pritchard (ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 3rd edn, 1969)
AnOr	Analecta orientalia
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
AOS	American Oriental Series
ARM	Archives royales de Mari
AuOr	*Aula orientalis*
AuOrSup	*Aula orientalis*, Supplements
BA	*Biblical Archaeologist*
BAH	Bibliothèque archéologique et historique
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
BASORSup	*Bulletin of the American Oriental Schools of Oriental Research*, Supplements
BDB	Francis Brown, S.R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907)
BdE	*Bibliothèque d'étude*
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium

BHS	*Biblia hebraica stuttgartensia*
BibOr	Biblica et orientalia
BMECCJ	*Bulletin of the Middle Eastern Culture Center of Japan*
BSO(A)S	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies*
BVSAWL	Berichte über die Verhandlungen der sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaft zu Leipzig
BZAW	Beihefte zur *ZAW*
CAD	Ignace J. Gelb *et al.* (eds.), *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1964–)
CARTU	J.C. de Moor and K. Spronk, *A Cuneiform Anthology of Religious texts from Ugarit* (SSS, NS 6; E.J. Brill, 1987)
CBQ	*Catholic biblical quarterly*
CPU	J.-L. Cunchillos and J.-P. Vita, *Concordancia de palabras ugaríticas en morfología desplegada* (Banco de datos filológicos semíticos noroccidentales; Madrid: CSIC, Institución Fernando el Católico)
CRAIBL	*Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres*
CRB	Cahiers de la *Revue biblique*
CTA	A. Herdner, *Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques découvertes à Ras Shamra–Ugarit de 1929 à 1939* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, Geuthner, 1963)
CTA	(Roman) used for text references
DAWIOV	Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften Institut für Orientforschung Veröffentlichung
DDD	K. Van der Toorn, B. Becking and P.W. van der Horst (eds.), *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995)
DLU	G. Del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín (eds.), *Diccionario de la Lengua Ugarítica* (AuOrS, 7; Barcelona: AUSA, 1996, 2000)
DNWSI	J. Hoftijzer and K. Jongeling, *Dictionary of the Northwest Semitic Inscriptions* (2 vols.; HOS 21; Leiden: Brill, 1995)
EI	*Erets Israel*
FARG	Forschungen zur Anthropologie und Religiongeschichte
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
HO	Handbuch der Orientalistik
HOS	Handbook of Oriental Studies
HR	*History of Religion*
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
IOS	*Israel Oriental Society*
JA	*Journal asiatique*
JANES	*Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society*

JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JAOSSup	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Supplements
JB	Jerusalem Bible
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JCS	*Journal of Cuneiform Studies*
JEOL	*Jaarbericht ... ex oriente lux*
JHC	*Journal of Higher Criticism*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JPOS	*Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
JSOTSup	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, Supplement Series
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
JSEA	*Journal for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities*
JSSM	*Journal of Semitic Studies* Monographs
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
KAI	H. Donner and W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1962–64)
KAI	(Roman) used for text references
KTU	*KTU*[1] = M. Dietrich, O. Loretz and J. Sanmartín, *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit* (AOAT, 24; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker, 1976). *KTU*[2] = M. Dietrich, O. Loretz and J. Sanmartín, *The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and Other Places* (ALASP, 8; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1995)
KTU	(Roman) used for text references
LS	H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek–English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 9th edn, 1940)
MARI	*Mari: Annales des recherches interdisciplinaires*
MCAAS	*Memoirs of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*
MIO	*Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung*
MLE	*Materiali lessicali ed epigrafici*
MRS	Mission de Ras Shamra
NABU	*Nouvelles assyriologiques brèves et utilitaires*
NorTT	*Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift*
NUS	*Newsletter for Ugaritic Studies*
OrAnt	*Oriens antiquus*
OLA	Orientalia lovaniensia analecta
OLP	Orientalia lovaniensia periodica
OLZ	*Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*
Or	*Orientalia*
PAAJR	*Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research*
PIBA	*Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association*

POS	Pretoria Oriental Series
PRU	*Le palais royal d'Ugarit*
PT	Pyramid Text
QS	Quaderni di semitistica
RB	*Revue biblique*
RHPR	*Revue de l'histoire et philosophie religieuses*
RHR	*Revue de l'histoire des religions*
RivB	*Rivista biblica*
RSF	*Rivista di studi fenici*
RSO	*Rivista degli studi orientali*
RSO	Ras Shamra–Ougarit
RSP	L.R. Fisher *et al.* (eds.), *Ras Shamra Parallels* (AnOr, 49–51; 3 vols.; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1972–81)
SBLDS	SBL Dissertation Series
SBLRBS	SBL Resources for Biblical Study
SBLWAWS	SBL Writings from the Ancient World Series
SEÅ	*Svensk exegetisk årsbok*
SEL	*Studi epigrafici e linguistici*
SHCANE	Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East
SMSR	*Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni*
SP	Studia Pohl
SPIB	Scripta Pontifici instituti biblici
SS	Studi semitici
SSR	*Studi storico-religiosi*
SSS	Semitic Studies Series
ST	*Studia theologica*
TEO	P. Bordreuil and D. Pardee, *La trouvaille épigraphique de l'Ougarit*. I. *Concordance* (RSO, 5 i; Paris: ERC, 1989)
TTS	Tutankhamun's Tomb Series
TynBul	*Tyndale Bulletin*
UBL	Ugaritische-Biblische Literatur
UCOP	University of Cambridge Oriental Publications
UF	*Ugarit-Forschungen*
UT	C.H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (AnOr, 38; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969)
UT	(Roman) used for text references
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	*Vetus Testamentum*, Supplements
WO	*Die Welt des Orients*
WUS	J. Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch der Ugaritischen Sprache* (BVSAWL Phil.-Hist. Klasse 106 Heft 3, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 4th edn, 1974)
WZG	*Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Ernst Moritz Arndt-Universität Greifswald* (Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe)

ZA	*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZDA	*Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*
ZDPV	*Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*

General Abbreviations

√	radical
‖	parallel
abs.	absolute
acc.	accusative
act.	active
adv.	adverb, adverbial
Akk.	Akkadian
Amor.	Amorite
app.	apparatus
Ar.	Arabic
Aram.	Aramaic
BD	(Egyptian) Book of the Dead
BHeb.	Biblical Hebrew
c.	common (gender)
col.	column
coll.	collective
compar.	comparative
conj.	conjugation
cs.	construct
D	doubled: piel
dat.	dative (= indirect object)
dd	double duty
denom.	denominative
det.	determinative
dittog.	dittograph(y)
DN	divine name
du.	dual
EA	El Amarna
Eg-Sem.	Egypto-Semitic
encl.	enclitic
Eng.	English
ep.	epithet(al)
ESA	Epigraphic South Arabian
Eth.	Ethiopic
f.	feminine
fin.	finite
Fr.	French

freq.	frequentative
G	ground, qal
Gk	Greek
Gt	ground, qal, with infixed *t* for reflexive sense
gen.	genitive
hapax	*hapax legomenon/a*: occurring only once
Heb.	Hebrew
hiph.	hiphil
hithp.	hithpael
Hitt.	Hittite
hoph.	hophal
Hur.	Hurrian
IA	Iron Age
imper.	imperative
ident.	identified
ind.	independent
indic.	indicative
inf.	infinitive
inst.	instrumental
interrog.	interrogative
intrans.	intransitive
JAram.	Jewish Aramaic
juss.	jussive
K.	*Kethib* (written)
LB(A)	Late Bronze (Age)
LebAr.	Lebanese Arabic
lit.	literally
m.	masculine
MB(A)	Middle Bronze (Age)
metath.	metathesis
MHeb.	Mishnaic Hebrew
mod.	modern
N	niphal
n.	note, noun
Neo-Ass.	Neo-Assyrian
NHeb.	New Hebrew
niph.	niphal
NK	New Kingdom
OB	Old Babylonian
obj.	object
p.	person
part.	particle
pass.	passive
Ph.	Phoenician
PHarris	Papyrus Harris

pi.	piel
pl.	plural, plate
PN	personal name
prep.	preposition(al)
pron.	pronoun
PT	Pyramid Text
pt. pts.	participle(s)
Q.	*Qere* (read)
R	recto
redupl.	reduplicated
ref., refs.	reference(s)
rel.	relative
Š	causative (hiphil)
sg.	singular
Skt	Sanskrit
Št	causative reflexive (hithpael)
subj.	subject
suff.	suffix
Sum.	Sumerian
Syr.	Syriac
T	Targum
THeb.	Talmudic Hebrew
TN	toponym
trans.	transitive
Ug.	Ugaritic
V	Verso
var.	variant
vb, vbs	verb(s)
voc.	vocative
WS	West Semitic

Part I
KTU 1.1–1.6

THE BAAL CYCLE OF MYTHS

(KTU 1.1 = CTA 1 = UT 'nt pl. IX-X = VI AB = RS 3.361)
(KTU 1.2 iii = CTA 2 iii = UT 129 = III AB C = RS 3.346)
(KTU 1.2 i, ii, iv = CTA 2 i, ii, iv = UT 137, 68 = III AB B, A = RS 3.367)
(KTU 1.3 = CTA 3 = UT 'nt = V AB = RS 2.[014] + 3.363)
(KTU 1.4 = CTA 4 = UT 51 = II AB = RS 2.[008] + 3.341 + 3.347)
(KTU 1.5 = CTA 5 = UT 67 = I* AB = RS 2.[022] + 3.[565])
(KTU 1.6 = CTA 6 = UT 49, 62 = I AB = RS 2.[009] + 5.155)

Select Bibliography

Virolleaud 1931, 1932, 1934a, 1934b, 1935a, 1936a, 1937, 1938, 1944–45a; Gordon 1949*: 9-49, 1977*: 67-117; Gaster 1950*: 115-222; 1961*: 114-244; Driver 1956*: 72-115; Jirku 1962*: 11-76; Aistleitner 1964*: 11-52; Ginsberg 1969*: 129-41; van Selms 1970; Cassuto 1971; de Moor 1971a, 1987*: 1-100; Caquot and Sznycer 1974*: 103-271; Clear 1976*: 2-30; Petersen and Woodward 1977; Coogan 1978*: 75-115; Gibson 1978*: 37-81; del Olmo 1981a*: 79-235, 1984: 29-104; Xella 1982*: 80-146, Grønbæk 1985; Meier 1986; M.S. Smith 1986a, 1994* (KTU 1.1–1.2 only at time of writing); Pardee 1988b, 1997c*: 241-74; Bordreuil and Pardee 1993a; Lloyd 1994; Herr 1995; Wyatt 1996b: 134-58, 1997, 1998a, 2001b; M.S. Smith in Parker 1997, 81-176*. (* indicates comprehensive translation.)

Frequently treated as a single composition (but see van Selms 1970, del Olmo 1983a, Meier 1986; cf. Pardee 1997c: 245 n. 34), the narrative of texts KTU 1.1–1.6 falls into three natural parts, reflected in the division in the present volume, treating respectively the antecedents of Baal's combat with Yam and culminating in the fight (1.1–1.2), the problem of the acquisition of a palace temple for Baal (1.3–1.4) and the confrontation between Baal and Mot (1.5–1.6). Other episodes appear to be interwoven with this (notably Anat's activities in 1.3), and texts outside the 'cycle' (KTU 1.7–1.13, 1.83, 1.92, 1.93, 1.117 and 1.133) have a loose connection, some being evidently scribal exercises. De Moor (1987: 1-2) also considers KTU 1.101 to be a fragmentary prologue to

the entire cycle, which is quite possible in principle, though its orthography immediately distinguishes it from tablets which can certainly or possibly be attributed to Ilimilku, and the present tablet, whatever its provenance, is probably a scribal exercise. But the modern reader should be cautious in view of the natural tendency to link traditions in order to provide them with some coherence. Scholars are not immune to this tendency.

This mythological material, and in particular the conflict of Baal with Yam, has important affinities with Hittite, Greek, Mesopotamian and Israelite–Judahite material, and is evidently one recension of a widespread and important tradition (see in particular Fontenrose 1959 and Forsyth 1987 for the comparative material), now traceable back to third millennium traditions concerning Tishpak, god of Eshnunna (Durand 1993; Bordreuil and Pardee 1993a; Lewis 1996c; Wyatt 1998a) and their putative Amorite antecedents. Early Sumerian traditions also provide a tantalizing, though probably indirect, background. Attempts to demonstrate a seasonal allegory as the basis of interpretation (all the early interpreters, but most comprehensively Gaster [1950, 1961] and de Moor [1971a, 1987]) have proved groundless. See Grabbe (1976) and M.S. Smith (1986a). This is not to deny a seasonal dimension to the Ugaritic cult, to which allusion may be found in KTU 1.6 iv 13-14, for instance, and in the various ritual calendars. It is however to reject the interpretation of the Baal myths as a literary construction outlining or even directly reflecting a ritual programme. The roots of the material appear to lie rather in royal ideology (Wyatt 1996b, 1998a, with regard to KTU 1.1–1.2). But as the biblical parallels show, mythic material of such ubiquity and power must have communicated complex meanings regarding cosmic management and the warding off of chaotic powers. Following the lead of Klengel (1969: II, 340, 343; 1992: 130) and Dietrich (1996: 38) I have suggested (1998a) that the entire composition of KTU 1.1–1.6 in its present extended form owes something to the need of King Niqmad II[1] (whose claim to the throne may have been in doubt)[2] for legitimization. Ilimilku may have woven a number of

1. On the problems of identifying the various Niqmads, and the problem of how many there were, see nn. 5 and 7 at KTU 1.113 and nn. 2 and 23 at 1.161.

2. Not too much should be built on circumstantial evidence. Klengel notes that Niqmad II uses Yaqaru's dynastic seal. This certainly points to his desire to build on the prestige associated with Yaqaru, and implicitly points to his own different genealogical antecedents. Whether this constituted a usurpation as such, or merely

loosely connected elements together to produce an epic poem on the king's behalf. This in turn would explain the stylistic differences and discontinuities which scholars have noted, if his overall contribution was essentially editorial, and even in his own composition indebted to the *Vorlage* of previously diverse materials. The analysis of Petersen and Woodward (1977), demonstrating the way in which the Baal-Mot conflict mirrors the Baal-Yam conflict, and is therefore arguably structured according to its template, is also of great interest, although since it is based on the surviving material only, its results remain provisional, like so much else concerning the meaning of the tradition. It should be noted that at least fifty per cent of the estimated content of KTU 1.1–1.6 is missing. This must have a significant bearing on matters of interpretation, varying from strophic analysis to larger-scale hermeneutics. The existence of scribal exercises citing fragments of the material (KTU 1.7, 1.8, 1.117, 1.133?) suggests a larger canon of tradition that was in use in the schools. I have a sneaking suspicion that KTU 1.10, dealing with the sexual relationship between Baal and Anat, may have belonged logically within the broad narrative at some point between KTU 1.3 and 4 (cf. Wyatt 1988a). But I would not wish to press the point. Its present form, on a tablet written on one side only, precludes its direct involvement within a longer series, at least in so far as a sequence is involved. It is also possible that it is to be related rather to events in KTU 1.5 v. But see now Wyatt (2001b).

Synopsis of the Narrative

KTU 1.1–1.2: Baal and Yam

1.1	i	———
	ii	Embassy from El to Anat...
	iii	Embassy from El to Kothar, who comes from Crete... (summoning deities to Yam's coronation?).
	iv	Declaration by El of Yam's royal status, and his coronation.
	v	Baal arrives, complains (?).
	vi	———
1.2	iii	Kothar is instructed by El to build a palace for Yam. Athtar's claim that he has no palace (temple) is dismissed ('KTU 1.2 iii b').

some other intricate manoeuvring such as has often accompanied royal successions down the ages, it is impossible to say with precision. We could speculate for ever!

iii a* (Three possible missing
iii c* columns—at least one
iii d* preceding surviving section.)[3]

1.2 i Yam sends messengers to the divine assembly to demand Baal's surrender. Baal reacts violently and is restrained.
ii ———
iii* ——— (unaccounted for in usual computations)[4]
iv Kothar supplies Baal with maces, with which he kills Yam.

KTU 1.3–1.4: Baal's Temple

1.3 i Feast in honour of Baal.
ii Anat at war. She fights in the valley between two towns and wades through gore, before going to a temple to perform bloody rites. She then washes.
iii When messengers come from Baal, Anat is perturbed, fearing danger to him, and insists that she had already killed Yam and his associates.
iv Anat goes to meet Baal, and says she will demand a palace (temple) for him from El, with threats.
v She comes before El, threatens him and pleads for Baal.
vi Athirat's assistant is sent to fetch Kothar.

1.4 i Kothar receives instructions and sets to work in his forge making gifts for Athirat.
ii Anat and Baal come to Athirat with them. She is perturbed until she sees the gifts.
iii Anat and Baal ask her to intercede with El.
iv Athirat goes to El, with Anat attending, and complains that Baal is a king without a palace (that is, a god without a temple).

3. Following Meier's analysis (1986), KTU 1.2 iii should perhaps be regarded as independent of the main narrative line of the rest of the material here translated. It is a parallel version, like other fragments. The surviving section, being a right-hand edge of a larger piece, must have been the second or third column of a four-column tablet. For convenience I have listed KTU 1.2 iii a*, c*, d* together. The section known as 'KTU 1.2 iii' is either iii b or iii c. For convenience let us call it iii b. The amount of missing material precludes any facile assumption of a more or less continuous narrative throughout the material now labelled KTU 1.2.

4. The text usually identified as KTU 1.2 iii in this enumeration cannot be identified with this missing column, because it is presupposed by the action of KTU 1.2 i, the first column of this four-columned tablet. See previous note.

v El accedes to her request. Anat takes Baal the news. Kothar sets to work.
vi Baal's palace (temple) is completed and an inaugural banquet is held.
vii Baal tours his kingdom.
viii Baal sends a message to Mot...

KTU 1.5–1.6. Baal and Mot

1.5 i ...who replies that since he has not been invited to the banquet, he will feast on Baal!
ii Baal behaves abjectly, and sends an obsequious reply.
iii ———
iv ———
v Baal is told to enter the underworld. En route, he copulates with a heifer which bears him a son.
vi Baal's body is found. El and Anat mourn him.

1.6 i Shapsh helps Anat recover Baal's corpse. Athtar is enthroned on Baal's throne, but comes down from it to rule.
ii Anat encounters Mot and ritually destroys him.
iii El has a vision of Baal's restoration.
iv Obscure conversation between Anat and Shapsh.
v A restored Baal fights a restored Mot.
vi The struggle unresolved, Shapsh intervenes and restrains Mot. The tablet ends with a hymn to Shapsh, and an extended colophon.

KTU 1.1–1.2: Baal and Yam

1.1 i (entirely missing: about 60 lines)

1.1 ii (fragmentary: about 60 lines: the following lines may come at any point in the column)

'...[1]

1.1 ii 1 [Grasp your spear (and) your mace,]
[ ] let your feet [hasten to] me,
[let] your legs [hur]ry [to me][2],
[ ] your message
and place [ ]
[ ] on top of your...

1.1 ii 5 [la]pis lazuli [ ]
[rai]se up in the midst of [ ]
[ ] bind
[he[3] will surely] die;
[his life-breath will go out like the wind,]
like spittle [his vitality,][4]

1.1 ii 10 [ ],
prepare [ ] to the earth[5],
[ ] for the end (of the world)[6] prepare.'

1. For the text that may have stood here cf. KTU 1.1 ii 17-23 etc. See nn. 2, 11-17 below for discussion of points raised in the formulaic passage.

2. This is part of a longer message formula appearing in a number of passages, the full list being KTU 1.1 ii 1-2, 17-23, iii 10-16; 1.3 iii 13-31, iv 7-20, 21-31. Cf. also n. 85 at KTU 1.3 vi end. There are sufficient differences between the various passages for it to remain impossible to reconstruct the present passage in full. Some editions go beyond, and others against, the evidence. On the analysis of the passage see Wyatt (1995b: 573-79).

3. I take it that the subject in this and the following line is Baal, who will have to die as rival to Yam when the latter is confirmed as king (in KTU 1.1 iv). This remains uncertain, however, in view of the poor state of the text.

4. The bicolon may be tentatively reconstructed on the basis of KTU 1.18 iv 24-25, 36-37 and 1.19 ii 38-39, 43-44. While both compositions are attributed to Ilimilku, this may well be a traditional formula describing a death.

5. Ug. *arṣ*. The term frequently has underworld connotations in mythological usage.

6. Ug. *špm*. I take it as 'end' (Heb. *sôp*). Cf. KTU 1.23.4, where it is used in a

[ ]
[ ]

Then[7]
[they set their faces towards] Inbub[8],
across a thousand courts,
1.1 ii 15 [ten thousand spaces[?]][9].

[at the f]eet of Anat [they bowed and fell down],
[they p]aid her homage[10] and [honoured her].
[They lifted up their voice and c]ried:

spatial rather than a temporal sense. May there be an inchoate eschatological sense present here?

7. Text *ilk*. Read *id ʾk*.

8. Inbub(u) is the dwelling of Anat, located somewhere on the massif of Saphon. See also KTU 1.13.9 and n. 10. According to KTU 1.100.20 she and Athtart live there. See Wyatt (1996b: 47). On Saphon, its etymologies, location (Jebel el Aqra on the Syro-Turkish frontier) and cosmological significance see Wyatt (1995a) and extensive bibliography *ad loc*. Anat is also associated with Aruru at KTU. 1.10 iii 29-30, which also appears to be part of the Saphon massif, and is probably to be linked with Anti-Casius, 'Mount Throne' of KTU 1.1 iii 12 (and n. 29). See also *nny* at KTU 1.16 i 8 and n. 200. Pardee (1997c: 243) reads this as part of the instructions to the messengers.

9. The usual formula is *alp šd...rbt kmn*, 'a thousand miles...ten thousand leagues' (as at KTU 1.1 iii 2 etc.). The term *ḫẓr* is unusual. The second colon is conjectural. I translate the latter term as 'courts' here. Elsewhere I have rendered it 'dwelling', as at KTU 1.2 iii 19 (see n. 18 *ad loc*.) and parallels. It is worth asking whether this is not a simple scribal error, so that we should instead read the usual formula as at KTU 1.1 iii 2 etc. (linear) or 1.2 iii [10]-11 etc. (area).

10. The form [*yšt*]*ḫwyn* (du.) is the only clue in this passage that there are two messengers, though confusingly it can also be read as 3 m. sg. energic. See also at KTU 1.1 iii 4. Messengers usually appear in pairs in the Baal cycle. Thus del Olmo (1981a: 163) and M.S. Smith (1994: 196-201). Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 301-303) take it to be one. De Moor (1987: 21) identifies the servant as Qadesh-and-Amurr, who appear(s) in KTU 1.4 iv, and takes the binomial name to denote one messenger. On the different nuances of the term in Ug. and Heb., according to context, see Gruber (1980: II, 90-123, 151-53, 187-200). Pardee (1997c: 243) introduces the formula 'Say to Girl 'Anatu | repeat to the sister-in-law of Li'mu' (= KTU 1.3 iii 11-12, see *CPU*, I, 525-26 for full list of occurrences of this and related formulae involving *btlt*), which does not occur in the present text, and is not to be restored. Cf. text at *CTA*, *KTU*[1 and 2]. If it is to be read, it requires to be bracketed <...>.

'Message of [Bull El your father],
[word of the W]ise One, your progenitor:
"[Bury w]ar [in the earth][11];
1.1 ii 20 set [strife[12] in the] dust[13]:
[pour a libation[14]] into the midst of the earth,
[honey from a jar[15] into the midst of the st]eppe.

11. In Wyatt (1995b: 574; 1996b: 256) I translated Ug. *qryy.barṣ.mlḫmt* as 'hollow out the damp earth', following Watson (1980: 9). Ug. *mlḫmt* derived from Akk. *luḫamum*, *luḫummu*, *luḫmu*, 'slime, mud', after Jacobsen (1976: 256 n. 332). His explanation for this term was however rejected by Lambert (1985: 189), and for a better explanation see now Ellis (1995: [esp.] 161). This throws us back on alternatives. Other main approaches are: 'Oppose war on earth': de Moor (1987: 21). Similarly Jirku (1962: 29), Ginsberg (1969: 136), Coogan (1978: 94) and del Olmo (1981a: 164). 'War upon the earth is opposed to my will': Driver (1956: 75). 'Come to me from the battlefield': Aistleitner (1964: 33). 'Place in the earth war': M.S. Smith (1994: 196). 'Put bread in the earth': Gordon (1949: 18; 1977: 78). Similarly Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 303), Gibson (1978: 51), Xella (1982: 100) and Pardee (1997c: 243, in his restored early part of col. ii). I am inclined to follow Smith in view of the fact that a specific ritual complex appears to be involved, which is probably royal in origin, and may be part of enthronement procedures. The war that is 'buried' may represent the victory of the *Chaoskampf*, appropriated by a king on his assumption of office. See Wyatt (1998a) for the context.

12. Ug. *ddym*. Parallelism requires either a synonym or an antonym for *mlḫmt*, 'war'. 'Strife': Ginsberg (1969: 136), followed here, as I think synonymous parallelism the likelier of the two. This is presumably based on the use of words (here 'love') to mean their opposites. 'Mandrakes' (cf. Heb. *dûday*, pl. *dûdā'îm*): Gordon (1949: 19) and Driver (1956: 75). 'Love': M.S. Smith (1994: 196, 203-205). 'Love-fruit': de Moor (1971a: 102; 1987: 21). 'Concord (loves)': *DLU*, I, 130 (an abstract pl.). 'Love-offerings': Pardee (1997c: 243).

13. 'Earth...dust' carry overtones of death. This supports the synonymous parallelism above: if war is given the last rites on the occasion of a royal accession (the *Sitz im Leben* of the present formula), strife should follow it into the grave.

14. Ug. *šlm*. The technical term 'communion sacrifice' is always pl. (*šlmm*). The present term appears to denote a libation. Cf. de Moor (1971a: 104). But see also Schwemer (1995).

15. Dividing *arbdd* into two words: *ar*, 'honey' + *bdd*, 'from a jar'. Similarly Gibson (1978: 51). 'Honey-like dew from a pot': de Moor (1971a: 103-104). De Moor's suggestion may be modified in the light of his 1975 note to mean, more generally, 'dew'. On the use of honey in the cult see n. 50 to KTU 1.14 ii 19. 'Rest': del Olmo (1981a: 164, 517, cf. Heb. *rābad*, Ar. *rabada*). With an evident change of mind: 'tranquillity': de Moor (1987: 21) and M.S. Smith (1994: 196, 206). So also del Olmo (1984: 153-55) and Pardee (1997c: 243). 'Multitudes of

Grasp [your spear (and) your mace][16]:

Let your [fe]et hasten [to me],
[let] your [legs hurry to me],

in the midst of the mountain,
[my divine rock,]
[Mount Saphon.]"'[17]

(some lines missing—see above)

1.1 iii (fragmentary—about 60 lines: the following lines may come at any point in the column, as in col. ii)

delightful things': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 303). My revised view of the preceding bicolon ('Bury war... dust') suggests a possible alternative approach here in accordance with the views just noted:

[pour peace] into the midst of the earth,
[tranquillity into the midst of the st]eppe.

We would then have an allusion to a ritual which firstly buries symbolic representations of the baleful realities of war and strife, and follows it with a similar ritual burial of positive symbols. But while the burial of the first would signify their disposal, the burial of the second would signify the planting of seed for new life. Do we perhaps have here a reference to actual rituals performed at the conclusion of a war? On the other hand, I think the case is stronger for the translation above, which having disposed of symbols of discord (possibly ritual burial of weapons? Cf. discussion of ritual hoards in Wyatt 1998a), now inters concrete symbols of well-being. The ritual use of both wine and honey has a wide pedigree. M.S. Smith's (1994: 202-208) allusion to the Eg. myth of the destruction of mankind, during which Hathor's excessive zeal for slaughter is deflected by the pouring out of *ddyt*, is evocative, but is perhaps rightly viewed with some caution, as by Pardee (1997c: 243 n. 14).

16. Ug. *ḥšk 'ṣk 'bṣk*, restored here from KTU 1.1 iii 10 and parallels. Construed thus by del Olmo (1981a: 161): *ḥšk* (Heb. *ḥāśak*) 'hold, retain', *'ṣk* 'your spear' (*'ṣ*, 'tree[-trunk]' as shaft of spear: cf. the 'Baal au Foudre' stela, RS 4.427); *'bṣk* 'mace' (Eth. *'ābēṣ*, Ar. *'aḍbu* [metath.]): del Olmo (1981a: 597). 'Make haste! be resolute! hurry on!': Gibson (1978: 51). Similarly Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 303), de Moor (1987: 20-22), M.S. Smith (1994: 196) and Pardee (1997c: 244). De Moor (1971: 106, with refs. to Ginsberg and Grelot) explains as three inf. (abs.) forms with suff. This seems entirely implausible on prosodic grounds. The allusion to weapons in this royal message formula evokes the ideology of the soteriological and cosmicizing function of 'divine' weapons, discussed in Wyatt (1998a).

17. Tentative restoration from KTU 1.3 iii 29. Alternatively, 'Mount Throne', as in KTU 1.1 iii 12.

...
[Then]
[they indeed set their face(s) [18]]
<towards Kothar-and-Hasis,>[19]
[towards Egypt[20], of all of which he is god[21]]
1.1 iii 1 [Cre]te the throne of [his dwelling[22]],
[Egypt the land of his inheritance],
over a thousand miles,
ten [thousand leagues].

[At the feet of Kothar] they bowed and fell down,
they p[aid him homage and honoured him].

And they said to Koth[ar-and-Hasis],
1.1 iii 5 [they declared to Hayin,] who is the [ambidextrous[23]]
craftsman:

18. Thus the number of messengers remains uncertain. They usually travel in pairs, though, like Scottish policemen, perhaps respecting a legal convention. Cf. n. 10 at KTU 1.1 ii 16. M.S. Smith (1992: 159) and Pardee (1997c: 244) translate all this as narrative describing the messengers' journey, while de Moor (1987: 22) treats it as instructions given to the messengers in the 2 p. du. The clue to the overall sense seems to be l. 17, in which Kothar replies to the message. This would be difficult for him to do unless the message had already been delivered. And in the normal style of the text we should expect an account of the delivery. The instruction would have been in the gap preceding iii 1.

19. Conjectural restoration. Cf. similar restoration at KTU 1.4 i 13-14. See Driver (1956: 74-75).

20. Or: 'Memphis'. Ug. *ḥkpt*. This transcribes Eg. *ḥwt kȝpṯḥ*, 'House of the Ka of Ptah', denoting the Ptah temple in Memphis, an identification originally proposed by Albright (1938). See M.S. Smith (1994: 165-67, with extensive refs.) Kothar is evidently an Ugaritic form of Ptah. The form *qsr* (loan-word from WS *kṯr*) is found in Egypt as an epithet of Ptah. This latter feature partially meets the hesitation voiced by Watson (1996a). Even if Aggoula's (1990: 7) alternative etymology for *ḥkpt*, *ḥqkpt* as 'hill' (Ar. *ḥiqfa*) be accepted, this can fit Memphis as a site of the rising of the primaeval *ben*-stone (at Memphis in the form of Ptah Ta-Tenen: *tȝ-ṯnn*, 'the Rising Earth'). See also nn. 77 (at KTU 1.3 vi 6) and 83 (at KTU 1.3 vi 15-16).

21. Ug. *il klh*. For an alternative explanation see Caquot (1987: 12-13). He proposes '(*Ḥkpt*) which *il* (sc. El) measured out'. Cf. Pardee (1997c: 244 n. 19).

22. Ug. *ṯbt*. Or: 'sitting'.

23. The significance of this epithet (restored after KTU 1.3 vi 23 and occurring at KTU 1.17 v 24-25) is evident if we remember the complex symbolism of left and right in ancient thought, on which see Wyatt (1996a). Normally people would

'[Message of Bull El your father],
word of the Wise One, [your progenitor[24]]:

"[ ], Kothar,
build[25] [ ]
place in the foundry[26] [ ]
prepare in the mountain[27] a dw[elling].

1.1 iii 10 Grasp your spear (and) [your] m[ace][28];

[let your feet hasten to me,]
let [your legs] hurry to me,

[towards the mountain,]
[towards] Mount Throne[29].
For [I have] a wor[d that I would say to you],
a message that I would repeat to you:

distinguish sharply between tasks carried out with the left hand and those with the right—notwithstanding those requiring two—and the symbolic differentiation maintained, together with the cultural tendency for right-handedness to predominate, and even be rigorously enforced. The two hands here form a merism, indicating that Kothar can accomplish all tasks. His skills are comprehensive, and beyond those of mere mortals. See Wyatt 2001a: 175 (§6[20]).

24. M.S. Smith (1994: 159) renders 'scion'!

25. Text *bn*[ ] (*KTU*[2]). I take it as imper. sg. 'Builder': thus de Moor (1987, p. 22). M.S. Smith (1994: 159) omits, despite pl. 8.

26. Ug. *skt*. Tentative translation, following the suggestion of Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 304 and n. c). Cf. M.S. Smith (1994: 159).

27. Ug. *ġrt*. Tentative translation (cf. M.S. Smith 1994: 159). We would expect pl. *ġrm*, but this is rather the sg. use here; perhaps it is a collective for the peaks of Saphon.

28. The text picks up the messenger formula of KTU 1.1 ii 17-22 etc., but omits the opening sequence.

29. Ug. *ġr ks*. Or: 'of my throne'. For my interpretation of this see Wyatt (1995a: [esp.] 222-24). To *ks* cf. *ksu* (Heb. *kissē'*) and also Heb. *kēs* (Exod. 17.16). See also at KTU 1.161.13, 20. This is the basis of the Gk form '*Kasion*', which also appears translated as '(Mt) *Thronos*', though the latter probably represents more specifically Ug. *nny*, Mt Nan(u), Anti-Casius, appearing at KTU 1.16 i 8. For the thematic significance of the throne in the ensuing series of myths see Wyatt (1996b: 34-44; 1996c). It is El's throne, upon which Yam, Baal and Athtar will in turn sit. While on Mt Saphon, it was no doubt identified with the throne in the city on which the kings of Ugarit were consecrated. Cf. the divine throne and royal rites in Judah: Ps. 110; 1 Chron. 28.5, 29.23. (Note that the bluff overlooking Damascus from the north is called 'Mt Qasioun'.)

[a word of tree and whisper of stone,]

the sighing[30] of the heavens to [the earth[31]],
[of the deep to the stars].

1.1 iii 15 A word unknown to me[n],
[and which the multitudes of the earth do not understand].

Come, and I shall reveal it
[in the midst of my divine mountain, Saphon[32]]."'

And Kothar-and-Hasis replied:

'[Go, go! attendants of the god(s) !]

You may delay[33],
but I shall [hurry]

[from[34] Crete] of the remotest of the gods,
Egy[pt of the remotest of the chthonian gods[35]],

30. Ug. *tunt*. In KTU 1.3 iii 24 (the same formula) it is written *tant*. *WUS* 27, §304, 'lament' (Heb. √*'ānâ* I), *DLU*, 42. Similarly de Moor (1971a: 107), Gibson (1978: 159), del Olmo (1981a: 161, 634): 'whispering'; Pardee (1997c: 244): 'conversings'. *UT* 496, §19.2507, 'rain' (cit. Eth. *tawʿan*) is unconvincing. Another possibility might be √*'ānâ* III, 'be opportune'. Cf. *taʿᵘnâ*, Jer. 2.24: 'time of copulation'. Here perhaps 'coupling of the heavens with the earth'?

31. Ug. *arṣ*. Here it carries the nuance 'underworld'. Note the chiasmus: 'heavens... earth... deep... stars' (a:b::b1:a1). 'Deep' (*thmt*, cf. Akk. *ti'amat*) represents the world-circling sea, also a symbol of the underworld. For the cosmology, broadly shared with biblical thought, see Wyatt (1996b: 19-115). M.S. Smith (1994: 160): 'Heaven... Hell... '. This is perhaps too modern.

32. Or: 'Mount Throne'? Cf. KTU 1.1 [ii 24], iii 12 and 1.3 iii 29. The latter passage suggests the restoration of *ṣpn* here and at 1.1 ii 24. On the argument for locating the dwellings of all the gods, El included, on Mt Saphon, in spite of appearances to the contrary, see Wyatt (1996b: 36-48; 1996c).

33. Ug. *bštm*. 'Delay' (del Olmo, [1981a: 530]: Ar. *bassa*, Heb. *bôšēš*, √*bûš*, as in Exod. 32.1). 'You should depart': de Moor (1987: 23).

34. *From* Crete ('Kaphtor'), according to de Moor (1987: 23), rather than 'to'. This is required by the immediate sequel. The identification with Crete is disputed. For a further suggestion see n. 36. For M.S. Smith (1994: 160), this bicolon is not syntactically linked to the preceding.

35. 'Of the gods... chthonian gods'. M.S. Smith (1994: 160) has both as vocative in form ('Kaphtor is indeed far, O gods'), which is attractive. Ptah of Memphis, mummiform and identified with Ta-Tenen (*tꜣ ṯnn*), 'the Rising Earth', is a chthonian god.

1.1 iii 20 two layers beneath [the springs of the earth],
[three expanses of] the depths'.[36]

Then
he set [his face]
[towards the Wise One], the perceptive god,

towards his mount[ain],
[Mount Throne.]

He rolled back the tent[37] of El,
[and he entered the pavilion[38] of the King], the Father of the Bright One[39].
[At the feet of El he bowed and fell down,]

36. To the imagery of ll. 18-20 cf. that of KTU 1.3 vi 4-16. Kothar's later analogues Hephaistos and Vulcan had their workshops under volcanoes. Is *kptr* perhaps to be identified as incorporating Thera-Santorini, whose volcanic activity was only too familiar to inhabitants of the eastern Mediterranean from the MBA? Ptah too (nn. 20, 35 above) was a chthonian god, though without volcanic attributes.

37. Ug. *ḏd* (Akk. *śadādu*, *šadādu*, 'to camp': Kutscher 1986). See also Clifford (1972: 51-53). On the problems of explanation see Renfroe (1992: 97-100). See also del Olmo (1984: 156-58) and Watson (1995a: 221-22).

38. Ug. *qrš*: cf. Akk. *karāsu*, *karāšu*, 'encampment'. See previous note.

39. Ug. *šnm*. Discussion in Pope (1955: 32-33). He dismisses the possibility of *šnm* being a proper name, because the deities *ṯkmn w šnm* (the likely source) 'have a very minor, nondescript and problematic role...' On the contrary, *šnm* ('Shanimu') is to be construed as a dawn-goddess, perhaps Athirat-Shapsh as El's daughter, and possibly of Vedic origin, the pair also appearing as Kassite deities. See Wyatt (1990a: 446-48; 1996b: 45 n. 54, 227-29). For etymology see Oldenburg (1969: 32-35): Ar. *snw*, *sny*, 'shine, be exalted, ancient, old'. I have taken the first of these options (cf. Heb. *šānâ* II, BDB, 1040), as fitting in with the etymology of Shumaliya. On the phenomenon of Indic gods in the west see O'Callaghan (1948). Shanim is a dawn-goddess in origin (Vedic Uṣas), and so an appropriate daughter for El, an *alter ego* of Athirat, herself both solar and a daughter (see KTU 1.23 and notes). Far from being 'very minor, (and) nondescript' (Pope), the goddess features prominently in ritual texts, evidently with royal associations (KTU 1.40.8, 17, 25, 34, 42; 1.41.12, 15, 31; 1.65.4 [with precedence over El and Athirat!]). Various other interpretations have been offered. Bauer (1933: 82), Gibson (1978: 53), del Olmo (1981a: 165), de Moor (1987: 16 n. 83, 113): 'father of years' etc., but 'years' is usually *šnt* in Ug. Or 'Shunem' (Pope: 'whatever that may mean'). My interpretation answers Pope's question. 'Luminaries' (Ar. *sanaya*, 'gleam, shine', cf. Jas. 1.17!): Oldenburg (1969: 17-18). I find this last suggestion an attractive alternative, though were this the sense we might expect the more common *kbkbm*. See also n. 35 to KTU 1.114.19.

1.1 iii 25 he paid him homage [and honoured him].
[And] Bull El [his] father [said:]
'[ ]
...'

(4 fragmentary lines)
(some lines missing: see above)

1.1 iv (fragmentary about 60 lines: the following lines may come at any point in the column)

1.1 iv 1 '[ ]
Aloud cry[40] to those who are n[ear]
[ ] to the distant ones,
[ ] cry that
"El is seated in [[41]]
1.1 iv 5 Shame ...[42] [ ]
[ ], gods, the house of your master[43],
[ ]
who indeed goes[44] quickly into the e[arth];
[ ] into the dust.

40. Ug. *ṣḥ*. I have taken this as imper. M.S. Smith (1994: 131) takes it as 3 pl. indic. qatal. For an alternative approach to this line see next note.

41. Text *m*[ ]. It is as likely that it should be restored *m*[*ṯbh*], 'his dwelling' (though *yṯb bmṯb* might be regarded as stylistically infelicitous), as the common restoration *m*[*rzḥh*]: 'his feasting-house' (*marziḥu*), (e.g. *CTA*, *KTU*^{2}, Gibson [1978: 39], M.S. Smith [1996: 131]). (KTU 1.114 narrates El's feasting activities: see l. 15.) On the other hand, to l. 2 above (text: *gm.ṣḥ.lq*[ ]) cf. KTU 1.114.2: [*gm*] *ṣḥ lqṣ ilm*: 'he cried: "To the carving, gods!" '. But we cannot restore one conjecture on the basis of another. Besides, 'distant ones' invites the restoration 'near ones' (*q*[*rbm*]) in the previous colon. Thus Gibson (1978: 39). M.S. Smith (1994: 131) restores this as *lqb*[*ṣ ilm*]: 'the ass[embly of the gods(?)]'.

42. Ug. *'llmn*. 'The vizir(?)': del Olmo (1981a: 158). 'Usurper...lit. "child-of-whom?"': de Moor (1971a: 116-17; 1987: 24 and n. 115). 'The Eternal One(?)': M.S. Smith (1994: 131). 'Eternal' (epithet of *rpum*): *DLU*, 77. Perhaps 'everlasting shame'?

43. The meaning of the words is clear, but the syntax cannot be made out. Is 'your master' (*b'lk*) Yam or Baal? If the former, perhaps these words are addressed with some irony, because of the 'misuse' of the title, to Baal.

44. If this stichometry is right, then *arṣ* is parallel to *'pr* ('earth...dust'), which would lead us to expect the verb *yrd* (*yrd arṣ*, 'die'). The following colon may be prosodically independent of this.

Muddy corruption [he gives to eat],
he gives to drink a surfeit of slime!"[45]'

He[46] took [a cup in his hand]
1.1 iv 10 a goblet in both his hands.

[ ] like grains of wheat[47],
like gravel[48] he gathered [ ]
El appointed his son regent[49],
Bull [ ]

Then the Wise One, the perceptive god, spoke[50]:
'[Yam] is the name of my son,

Lord[51] of the god[s[52] is Nahar!]'

45. This is perhaps what Yam offers his guests, almost a taste of death. Cf. Mot's diet in KTU 1.5 i 18-20. The dead eat clay in Mesopotamian tradition. Only Baal will provide real nourishment.

46. Sc. El? This is to understand the colon as narrating the beginning of the enthronement rites of Yam. On the other hand it may still be Yam (thus, for example, de Moor 1987: 25), which would answer the question posed in n. 48. See also discussion in M.S. Smith (1994: 146-47).

47. Ug. *kmll*. Thus Virolleaud (1938: 98) compared Heb. *mᵉlîlâ*, followed by Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 308 and n. j). 'Crumbs': de Moor (1971a: 116; 1987: 25). 'Scraps': del Olmo (1981a: 158). 'Pulp': M.S. Smith (1994: 132, 147).

48. Ug. *ḥṣ*. Cf. Akk. *ḫiṣṣu*, Ar. *ḥaṣātu*, Heb. *ḥāṣāṣ* (de Moor 1971a: 118; del Olmo 1981a: 548). The language is a simile. It is unclear what exactly El is gathering. But if Yam is the subject of *ytn* in l. 9, then it is presumably the mud he gives his guests.

49. Ug. *tgr*. I accept de Moor's proposal, and read <*y*>*tgr* (Dt of √*gr*: Ar. *ǧarrā*[*y*]) 'appoint a deputy'.

50. What follows requires that this be interpreted as a formal enthronement, so that Yam is to be understood as sitting on the throne, which is that of El. The incumbency by successive gods of this same throne may be seen as ideologically significant for the monarchy of Ugarit. Just as it is sons of El who are enthroned, so it is also those who are enthroned who are declared to be sons of El. Thus the ritual is in part a legitimization procedure, which would incorporate any new king, whatever his personal antecedents, into the royal dynasty, in effect concocting a royal genealogy.

51. Ug. *yw*. This is probably a Skt. loan-word (<*yau* <*dyaus*) occurring in various Near Eastern contexts, including, perhaps, the DN Yahweh. The apparent sense was 'lord', or even 'god', given the equation in BM 93035 *ilu* = *yau*. Discussion and refs. in Wyatt (1989a: 21-25). See also de Moor (1971a: 118-19) for further references to the debate, and cf. n. 217 at KTU 1.16 i 36.

52. Text *il* [ ]. The beginning of the third character is just visible, and is

1.1 iv 15 And he proclaimed the name 'Yam',
[and pronounced the name 'Nahar'?]
They responded to him:
'You shall indeed invest him[53],
[ ]
You shall proclaim him "Lord".'
[And El replied:]
'I am the Wise One, the [perceptive] god.
Over my hands I pronounce [ ]
1.1 iv 20 Your name is "Beloved of E[l"][54]
[I shall give you a] house of silver,
[a palace] out of [gold],
from the hands[55] of Valiant Ba[al]

commonly read *t*: (*il* [*t*]), *KTU*^{2} and M.S. Smith (1994: 132): *ilt* [ ]. I propose *il* [*m*].

53. Ug. *lzntn*. Construed as *l* emphatic, with *zntn* 2 sg. √*zny*, Ar. *zāna*, 'embellish, adorn', with 3 p. obj. suff. The regalia of kingship are handed over at this point. 'For our sustenance': Gibson (1978: 39; or, n. 7: 'for our adornment'), del Olmo (1981a: 159) and M.S. Smith (1994: 132, 149); similarly de Moor (1971a: 120: Akk. *zinnātu*, 'support, maintenance').

54. Through ll. 13-20 we can perhaps discern the giving of a fivefold titulary, modelled on the Eg. pattern. The new king of the gods is Yam, Nahar, 'Lord of the gods' (*yw il*[*m*]), 'Lord' (*adn*), and 'Beloved of El' (*mdd il*). On the last title and its implications see Wyatt (1985a: 120-25). Note that El himself, with a laying on of hands, transmits his royal authority to the new king (who sits on his [El's] throne). This is suggestive of the ideology behind the Ugaritic monarchy, which has close analogues in Judah. Cf. 1 Chron. 29.23; Ps. 110.1.

55. Ug. *bd*. Though Baal is Yam's successor on the divine throne, it appears from the present passage that he also had a prior claim to it, but was passed over by El in favour of Yam. There is no justification for reading any seasonal significance into this. It is rather part of the dramatic structure, and in addition indicates that a kingship of sorts is given to all four gods, Yam, Baal, Athtar and (implicitly) Mot. All are kings under the overall suzerainty of El: he is not deposed or rendered superfluous or otiose. If a case were tenable on the evidence of KTU 1.1 v (see n. 59), it would have to be balanced against the theological presuppositions of the Keret story (KTU 1.14–1.16), which presents El as the only effective divine power in support of the king (Athirat works against his interests, the other gods are conspicuous by their impotence in KTU 1.16 v, though in part this is to highlight El's own supreme power). This argument is all the stronger given the common scribal and even authorial role of Ilimilku. It is hard to credit that the same writer

Since he has scorned me [ ],
drive him from the thro[ne of his kingship],
[<from the back-rest,>][56]
1.1 iv 25 from the siege of] his dominion!

But if [you] do not [ ]
he will smite you like [ ]'

El gave a feast[57] [ ]
he proclaimed his son [ ]

1.1 iv 30 He slaughtered oxe[n and sheep]
[he felled] bulls
and [the fattest of rams]
[year-old calves]
[skipping] lambs,
[kids.][58]

would present two contradictory theologies. On the relationship of the gods' roles see Wyatt (1989b). Contrast de Moor (1971a: 116) with *idem.* (1987: 26). 'In the hands': M.S. Smith (1994: 132). To this colon del Olmo (1981a: 160) restores the pair ['from the hand of the Charioteer of the Clouds'], but there is insufficient room for this.

56. Some commentators (e.g. Gibson [1978: 39], cf. *KTU*[2] which cites KTU 1.3 iv 2-3 as parallel) also restore *lnḫt*, 'from the divan, seat', and the like: the term means '(place of) rest'; but I wonder if there is sufficient space. It should perhaps be treated as an unintentional omission (restored <...>). The three terms *ksu*, *nḫt* and *kḥṯ* commonly occur in this formula. The first and third terms are effectively synonymous (the latter Hur.); I have treated *nḫt* as a part of the throne, and *kḥṯ* as another part, the seat (here rendered 'siege'). I have according translated *nḫt* as 'back-rest'. (Note also the use of 'seat' [*ṯbt*] at KTU 1.1 iii 1 and 1.2 iii 17, where the word is ambiguous.) The basis for this distinction of parts is the construction of the throne at KTU 1.4 i 34-35, where *kḥṯ* is best understood as a part of the larger whole. If 'back-rest' should sound rather prosaic, it should be remembered that a throne with a high back would be a specifically royal or divine item of furniture, the back being a feature worthy of remark. Cf. KTU 1.6 i 60-61, where Athtar's head does not reach the top of the throne (*aps*). This must be the top of the back-rest. Cf. comment at KTU 1.4 i 33-34 n. 91. Whether the restoration is required here is a matter for debate. At KTU 1.2 iv 12-13, 19-20, the use of *nḫt* would be inappropriate, since the binomial *ym*...*nhr* controls the prosody. Cf. also at KTU 1.2 i 4. Baal is here to be driven from his throne; at KTU 1.3 iv 1-3 Anat avenges Baal against those who drove him from it; at KTU 1.6 v 5-6 he sits on it for the first time (so far as the extant text is concerned).

57. On this comprehensive use of *dbḥ*, cf. KTU 1.114.1.

58. The standard formula for a divine feast. See Lloyd (1990).

(some lines missing—see above)

1.1 v (fragmentary—about 60 lines)[59]

1.1 vi (about 60 lines entirely missing)

1.2 iii a* (putative first column of four: 1.2 iii following would have followed it, if second column of tablet)

1.2 iii[60] (ll. 1-3 illegible)[61]

59. Some scholars try extensive reconstruction of this column, a case of making bricks without straw. See, e.g., de Moor (1987: 27-28) and M.S. Smith (1994: 117-18). Others try to draw far-reaching conclusions from it, which is incautious. See, e.g., Pope (1955: 30) and Oldenburg (1969: 112-19), who use Gk and Hitt. 'parallels' to postulate El's castration and deposition. There are certainly intriguing problems and more intriguing possibilities here, but a tablet in this condition is simply unable to resolve any of them. The key parts of the text are firstly l. 9, which reads [ ]*ktasrn*, and l. 22, which reads [ ]*tasrn.ṯr il*. The two are commonly harmonized. Secondly, ll. 11 and 23 contain the term *abnm* (possibly 'stones'). Thirdly, *mtny* appears in ll. 12 and 25, and *mtnh* in l. 14. ('my/his loins'?). The first phrase Pope renders as 'they bind Bull El', which is certainly a possible, but not the only possible translation. Given the state of the column, we cannot know whether *ṯr il* is even syntactically in the same sentence as 'they (or "you", or "she") bind(s)'. The second and third may of course be understood to refer to a castration, but need not, and if they do it certainly need not be El's. Note that binding (*asr*) also appears to be mentioned at KTU 1.1 ii 7, and that Baal is placed, presumably bound, as a captive under Yam's (= El's) throne at KTU 1.2 iv 6-7. There is no question there of Baal's castration. The strongest general argument against the presence here of a myth of El's deposition is the authority he evidently continues to exercise throughout the Baal cycle of myths, where all decisions are deferred to him. He also remains the final arbiter of royal authority and destiny in the Keret and Aqhat stories. It seems that the feature of the Hitt. and Gk traditions is an Anatolian rather than a Semitic motif, though they may owe something, independently of the West Semitic material, to the primaeval traditions of Mesopotamia (such as the killing of Apsu in the *Enuma Elish*).

60. This column is independent of KTU 1.2 i, iv. Its present conventional numbering is unhelpful, to say the least. See discussion in Meier (1986). Pardee (1997c: 247-48) places it between KTU 1.2 i and iv, which is impossible as I read the text, since the events of 1.2 i presuppose those of 1.2 iii. He acknowledges (p. 241) the problem of the texts even coming from the same tablet, and offers an explanation of his procedure (p. 245 n. 34 and p. 247 n. 44). He considers the arguments of Meier (1986) inconclusive.

61. *KTU*^{2} reads [ ]r.*lrḥ*q[ ] in l. 2 (cf. *CTA*, *KTU*^{1}, M.S. Smith [1994: 211], each of which is slightly different), and round it restores the formula of KTU 1.1 iii

[Then]
he[62] set his face indeed

towards [E]l at the source of the ri[vers[63]],
[amidst the springs of the two deeps[64].]

1.2 iii 5 [He rolled back] the tent of E[l]
and entered the [pav]ilion of the King, [the Father of the Bright One[65]].

[At the feet of El he bowed] and fell down,
[he] paid him homage and honour[ed him].

[Then Bull El his father spoke:]

'[Listen, O Ko]thar-and-Ha[sis]!

Depart:
build a house for <Prince> Yam,
[const]ruct a palace for Ruler Na[har]
...[66]
Depart, Kothar-and-[Hasis],
build a house for Prince Yam,

18-21 (*kptr...ġrym*): 'Crete...depths'. The *l* is the only complete letter in the first three lines! Note however that the restored formula is also followed by the journey to El's dwelling in both passages.

62. That is, Kothar.

63. The rivers will have been four in number, as in Gen. 1.10-14. This is the centre of the world.

64. Cf. Gen. 1.7 and Ps. 42.8 (Eng. 7), which allude to the same motif. Temple symbolism also placed the resident god at the centre of the universe. This is the omphalos, the place of true reality, the still centre of the turning world. El, the absolute deity, is immovable, and all the other deities revolve around him.

65. Ug. *šnm*. See n. 39 at KTU 1.1 iii 24.

66. Apparently something else is required here. Virolleaud (1944–45a: 5) read [*b*]*i*(?)*rtk*, partly followed by M.S. Smith (1994: 213, 218); *CTA* reads [ ](h/i)*r*n.w[ ], while *KTU*^{2} reads [n]h*r tk*.[ ]. But however read, it does not yield a sentence, nor obviously fit the context. Cf. the suggestion of *KTU*^{2} for l. 9 (following note). Does it belong here too? Are we to interpret the counterpoint of a temple for Yam against a temple for Baal as some echo of an earlier cult-rivalry in Ugarit? For a maritime nation a sea-god might seem as obvious a patron as a storm-god. Cf. the situation in Eshnunna, where the *mušḫuššu* dragon was at one point in the mythic narrative the patron of Eshnunna, later displaced by Tishpak. Texts in Wyatt (1998a). The Eshnunnan myth is generally agreed to be an import from Amurru. 'Palace': see n. 38 at KTU 1.12 ii 60.

[constr]uct a pala[ce for Ruler] Nahar,
[in the recesses of Saphon.][67]

1.2 iii 10 [Speedily let his ho]use be built,
[qui]ckly let [his palace be con]structed.

[A thousand square yards let the] house [take up],
[ten thousand] acres[68] the pala[ce].'

[ ]
[ ][69]
Whereupon[70]
Athtar [the royal one[?][71] lifted up his voice and cried:]

67. The end of l. 9 is lost. *KTU*^{2} reads u (Roman) before the lacuna (*CTA*: [ ]ṣp[ ]; M.S. Smith [1994: 211]: k[ ]p°[ ]). (See Wyatt 1996b: 38 for discussion of the reading of l. 9.) The 'u' may be *ṣ*, which would fit *KTU*^{2}'s own suggestion that the expression *btk.ṣrrt.ṣpn* from KTU 1.4 v 55 should be read here. Cf. del Olmo (1981a: 166). My provisional translation reflects this suggestion. Ll. 7-9 seem to be dittographic.

68. The terms *šd*, *kmn*, are generally translated as area terms even when they are clearly used in a linear sense (e.g. KTU 1.1 iii 2). In such instances I have translated 'miles... leagues'. Here area terms are required, hence 'square yards... acres'. Metricization seems out of place! We noted above (n. 9) the anomalous KTU 1.1 ii 14[-15].

69. Ll. 11-12: very uncertain reading. Many leave untranslated. De Moor, substantially accepting the reading of *KTU* ^{1}, (so also *KTU* ^{2}), translates (1987: 36) as follows:

uštḫš [ym b]t bġlm	'For [Yammu] desires a house in the dark,
lšd mr ymm	in the bitter field of the sea!
[b'l] bym ym ymt	Let [Ba'lu (?)] die in the deepest sea!'

This is a brilliant interpretation of this text, but whether the tablet supports this reading is another matter. For a minimalist assessment see M.S. Smith (1994: 211).

70 Text very damaged. Virolleaud (1944–45a: 2 [pl.] and 7) read *t*(?)*pk*. *CTA* (with same pl.) reads *apk*. *KTU*^{2} read pn (Rom.); M.S. Smith (1994: 211), illegible signs. The reading *apk*, if tenable, needs to be corrected to *ap<n>k*.

71. Uncertain. Cf. Gibson (1978: 37). Virolleaud (1944–45a: 2 [pl.], 6) read *dtm*(?).[ ]. *CTA* read *d*(t/m)[--], but at l. 18 read *d*(t)m[-]*k*, and suggested (p. 10 n. 6) that *dm*[*lk*] should perhaps be read, followed by Gibson (1978: 37-38: 'the possessor of kingship') and del Olmo (1981a: 166-67: 'the pretender') in both instances. *KTU*^{2}: *d* t[ ] and d[m].k×. M.S. Smith (1994: 211): d°°[ ], d[ ]k. Reading *dmlk* (lit. 'of kingship') of Athtar is a pointer to his royal ideological function, clearly emerging from KTU 1.6 i 44-67, where Athtar's enthronement is the paradigm of the human institution (Wyatt 1986a).

'[ ]
[ ] fire [ ]
[ ] carrying [ ]
[ ]
go down [ ] him'.[72]

1.2 iii 15 Then the luminary of the gods, Shapsh, [spoke] to him.

She lifted up her voice and [cried:]

'[Hear]ken, I pray, [Athtar],

Bull El your father [has sh]own favour[73] to[74] Prince Yam,
to[75] [Ru]ler Nahar.

[How will] Bull [E]l your father listen to you?

He will surely pull up the [sup]port of your seat[76];
he will surely [overturn the throne of] your kingship;
he will shatter the sceptre of your rule!'

And [Athtar], the r[oyal] one, replied:

'Bull El my father [has tak]en [it?] from me:

I have no house like [the] gods,
1.2 iii 20 no dwelling[77] like [the sons of the Holy] One[78].

72. Text very damaged. De Moor's (1987: 36) treatment is too confident. Athtar appears to intervene, presumably to complain at Yam's elevation, but details are irrecoverable.

73. Ug. [*yṯ*]*ir*. √*ṯar*, 'stand surety for', del Olmo (1981a: 167, 640; Ar. *ṯa'ara*). 'Grant his favour': de Moor (1987: 37). 'Cause table to be set', correcting *ṯar* to *ṯ'r*: *UT* 500, 505, §§19.2631, 2719; accepting *ṯar* as equivalent to *ṯ'r*: Gibson (1978: 38, 159). 'Take vengeance(?)': M.S. Smith (1994: 218) and Pardee (1997c: 247). Watson (1996a: 79-80) suggests 'be victorious' (Akk. *ša'āru*).

74. Ug. *l.pn*: lit. 'to the face of'.

75. As last. Virolleaud (1944–45a: 2 [pl.], 7) reads *ṣu*[ ]. *CTA* corrects to *l*pn. Thus *KTU*[2] and M.S. Smith (1994: 211).

76. Ug. *ṯbt*: either 'sitting' or 'dwelling'. 'Seat' carries both nuances, as well as referring to the concrete object. Cf. at KTU 1.1 iii 1 and n. 22.

77. Ug. *ḥẓr*. Preferable to 'court' (as, e.g., Gibson [1978: 38]) in this context. Cf. at KTU 1.1 ii 14 and n. 9. The previous word-pair *bt* || *hkl* now gives way to *bt* || *ḥẓr*.

78. Ug. *qdš*. This denotes El, and not Athirat. The goddess Qudshu is a modern invention. All the Eg. examples adduced in her reconstruction have the f. indicator (*qdšt*). For a list of these see Boreux (1939) and Leibovitch (1961). Del Olmo's translation (1981: 167), 'the holy ones' (so also M.S. Smith 1994: 219), highlights the translation that would be appropriate in a non-mythological context; cf. *bn*

Alone[79] I shall go down from my living condition[80].

The skilful gods[81] will wash me...[82] in the house of
[Prince] Yam,
in the palace of Ruler Naha[r]!

Bull El his father has shown favour t[o Pr]ince Ya[m],
[to Ruler Nahar.]

Shall I[83] rule, or shall I not rule?'

'Since you [have] no wife like [the gods]
[nor sacred bride[84] like the holy ones],

Prince Yam [ ]
Ruler Na[har] will be en[throned?[85]]'.

[ ]
[ ] he sent him.

1.2 iii 25 And Athtar [the royal one] replied:

'[ ]

il(*m*), mythologically 'sons of El', more generally 'gods' (and therefore equivalent to Heb. *qᵉdōšîm*, 'holy ones' = 'gods'). The term *qdš* may be abstract: 'holiness'. Cf. n. 203 at KTU 1.16 i 11.

79. Text *lbdᵗm*. (*CTA* /b-m...perhaps *lbdᵗm*, *KTU*² /bdm; rather than *lbum* ('[like] a lion': M.S. Smith 1994: 219). 'Alone': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 124 and n. o), Gibson (1978: 38) and del Olmo (1981a: 168). Reading *lbum*, Al Noori (1994: 170) proposes 'groaning' (Akk. *lābû*, 'howl'). See Pardee (1997c: 248 n. 52).

80. Ug. *bn*[*p*] *šny*. 'Into both our graves': Driver (1956: 79), also Gibson (1978: 38 and n. 5). 'In my throat' (differently construed, with succeeding words): Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 125). 'My "vomit"(?)': del Olmo (1981a: 168); 'with my desire': M.S. Smith (1994: 219).

81. The *ktrt* deal with affairs of conception and birth (KTU 1.17 ii 26-42; 1.24); it appears that male counterparts, *ktrm*, deal with death and its ritualization.

82. *KTU*² reads [*yṯ*]*b* for the damaged text at this point: 'dwelling in'. *CTA*: [--]b.

83. Ug. *mlkt*. I take it to be Athtar speaking. So also Gibson (1978: 38) and M.S. Smith (1994: 220). 2 sg.: Driver (1956: 79), Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 125), del Olmo (1981a: 168) and de Moor (1987: 37), addressed to Athtar by Shapsh. 'But I am king [...] I am indeed king': Pardee (1997c: 248).

84. See n. 99 at KTU 1.2 i 13.

85. Reading *yṯ* [*ṯb*], with *KTU*². *CTA* *y*'[--]. Cf. Virolleaud's transcription (1944–45a: 11: *y*'(?)[..]. Pl.: 2 = *CTA* ii fig. 5). 'His Highness Yammu replied': de Moor (1987: 38).

...'

(perhaps 30 lines missing)

1.2 iii c* (Tablet KTU 1.2 iii is a small fragment of a larger tablet
1.2 iii d* of four columns. Column a* allowed for above)

1.2 i 1 '[ ]
[ ]
You rose up against [[86]]
[ ]'
Valiant Baal [replied[?]]:
'[I shall drive you from the throne of your kingship]
[from your back-rest,]
1.2 i 5 [from the siege of] your dominion!
[ ]
[ ]
[Expeller will strike] you on the head, [Yam[87]]
All-Driver[88] [will smite you on the skull,] Ruler Nahar!
May [Horon] smash, [O Yam],
[may Horon smash] your head,
Athtart-the-na[me-of-Baal your skull]![89]
[...[90]]

86. Del Olmo (1981a: 168) wonders whether the obj. was 'me': this would make this a dialogue between Yam, who is speaking, and Baal, who replies.

87. We might expect 'Prince Yam' (*ẓbl ym*) on the basis of the usual expression *ẓbl ym* || *ṯpṭ nhr*. But from here to KTU 1.2 iv 14, where the normal pattern is resumed, the element *ẓbl* is consistently absent. In one or two instances it would be tempting to restore <*ẓbl*>, but with ten instances in succession, it is clearly not an error, but an editorial feature, perhaps pointing to a unit with its own *Vorlage*.

88. Note that Baal (or the poet) anticipates the naming of the weapons in KTU 1.2 iv 11-23. De Moor (1987: 30 n. 126) puts this down to divine foresight.

89. This curse-formula may be restored on the basis of its use at KTU 1.16 vi 54-58, though it appears to have been an expanded form.

90. Text [ ]×*t* (*KTU*[2]; *CTA* [--]*t*, M.S. Smith [1994: 260]: °°t). The previous sign could be an *m* ([*m*]*t*). Thus de Moor (1986: 257), who also restores previous sign: [*m*]m*t*: 'place of death'. It probably belongs with missing text of l. 8, where about 9 signs are unaccounted for by restoration according to || KTU 1.16 vi 54-58.

may you fall down[91] in the pri[me of life[92],]
[(empty)-handed[93] and humiliated[94]!]'

2 i 10 The Father of the Bright One (has) two wives[95],
[ ]
Yam sent messengers,
[Ruler Nahar an embassy.]
With great rejoicing[96] they flew h[eavenwards[?97]]
[ ]
their nostrils flaring[?98].

91. Ug. *mṭ*. 'Down': Ginsberg (1969: 130) and de Moor (1986: 257). Cf. Rin (1968: 53) and Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 128 n. g). 'Staff' (cf. Heb. *maṭṭê*): Gibson (1978: 40) and M.S. Smith (1994: 265). Note that while the verb 'fall' here is *tpln*, in KTU 1.16 vi 57 it is *tqln*.

92. Ug. *bgb* [*l šnt*]. Lit. 'at the height of years'. The term *gbl* has two senses, probably differentiated from one √: cf. del Olmo (1981a: 531) √ I (cf. Heb. *gᵉbûl*), 'frontier', limit'; √ II (cf. Ar. *gabalu*), 'summit, mountain'. The second sense seems to be the basis of the idiom here. 'The height of your years': de Moor (1987: 30) and M.S. Smith (1994: 265). 'At the frontier of your years' (= at the end of your life? less likely): Gibson (1978: 102: KTU 1.16 vi 57-58) and del Olmo (1981a: 169). Al Noori (1994: 101) proposes explaining *šnt* by reference to Syr. *šenā*, 'great honour, authority'. Thus 'from the height of your authority'.

93. Ug. *bḥpnk*. Cf. Heb. *ḥōpen*, 'hollow of hand'. So Gibson (1978: 102), 'with your hands empty'. 'For your greed': del Olmo (1981a: 322). 'In the prime of your strength': de Moor (1987: 30). 'For thine impiety': Driver (1956: 47, 139) treating it as metath. for *ḥnp*: Ar. *ḥanafa*, 'leaned on one side'. The whole colon is restored on the basis of KTU 1.16 vi 58.

94. Ug. *ṯ'n*. √*'ny*, cf. Heb. √*'nh* III, 'humble, afflict' (BDB, 776). Thus Gibson (1978: 102), del Olmo (1981a: 323) and de Moor (1987: 30). 'And one will say': Jirku (1962: 21), Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 574 and n. f).

95. El's two wives, Athirat and Rahmay, hypostases of Shapsh, are the subjects of the theogony of KTU 1.23. For analysis of this see Wyatt (1996b: 224-29).

96. Ug. *b'lṣ 'lṣm*. Cs. phrase, with superlative sense. To √*'lṣ* cf. Heb. *'lṣ*.

97. Tentatively reading *šm*[*mh*]. Cf. de Moor (1987: 31). Part of the first *m* only is visible. It is strange that they should fly before receiving their instructions. Perhaps, eager to be off, they are flying up and down before their instructions are given.

98. Text *uṭ ṯbr aphm*. 'Flaring', conjectural. Cf. del Olmo (1981a: 524): 'rupture'. For *uṭ* see Rin (1968: 54) and van Selms (1970: 258-59, 'snorting'), followed by Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 128 n. j) citing Ar. *'aṭṭa*, 'groan'. De Moor (1987: 31): 'the bills of their beaks (open) to a span'. This is to see the messengers in avian form (cf. Korpel 1996, though not explicitly of this passage), while at ll. 41-42 below it seems that they are anthropomorphic. Of course a combination of

'Depart, divine assistants[99]—do not stay!
[Indeed],
set your [faces]
towards the convocation of the Council[100],
tow[ards the divine[101] mountain.]

1.2 i 15 [At the feet of El] you shall fall[102];

both forms is possible. A stela from Ras Shamra (RS 2.[038], Yon 1991: 329 fig. 9c) shows a female figure holding a spear and an obscure device, and clad in a long dress in the form of a falcon's wing. Is this a representation of a winged Anat, such as appears in KTU 1.18 iv 21 and 1.108.8-9?

99. Ug. *ǵlmm*. For general treatment of Ug. *ǵlm* and its f. counterpart *ǵlmt* see Vawter (1952). Its use in Ug. appears to be restricted to deities and royal persons, with one exception, noted below. While it undoubtedly has a basic sense of 'young person', its actual use in every instance requires that we acknowledge an ideological or theological dimension to it in such contexts. I have accordingly given a variety of translations. With minor deities, as here, who serve as messengers of the chief characters in the myth (the very prototype of angels), I translate 'divine assistants'. Gupan and Ugar appear in KTU 1.8 ii 7 to be *bn ǵlmt*, 'sons of the sacred bride', whom I earlier took to be Athirat (1985: 52 n. 29). However, this passage is to be construed quite differently, *ǵlmt* (Heb. *ṣalmāwet*) meaning 'darkness'. See n. 171 at KTU 1.4 vii 54. With Keret, who has a close relationship with El (mythologically speaking, he is his 'son': that is, as a *bn il* Keret participates in divinity), I have translated *ǵlm* as 'heir', at KTU 1.14 i 40. Cf. KTU 1.14 iii 49, of Yasib, as Keret's heir. With Hurriy, who will be Keret's queen, I have translated *ǵlmt* as 'sacred bride' at KTU 1.14 iv 41, as also of Athtar's hypothetical, but non-existent wife at KTU 1.2 iii 23 (if restored, as by Whitaker 1972: 515). The exception is at KTU 1.19 ii 28, where two anonymous characters arrive with the news of Aqhat's death. I have here translated *ǵlmm* (du.) as 'two young men', to avoid prejudging the issue of their identity. I suspect that they are probably divine messengers, however, put into the narrative as a catalytic means of informing Danel of his son's death. But there is nothing to prove this. On the significance of *ǵlmt* and its Heb. counterpart *'almâ* (used in Isa. 7.14), where, if the tradition is to be traced back to Isaiah of Jerusalem, it perhaps denotes Ahaz's pregnant queen Hepzibah, who is carrying Hezekiah, see Wyatt (1985b: 45, 52 n. 29). The phraseology of the Heb. has the same *Sitz im Leben* as KTU 1.24.7. Particularly difficult to interpret with certainty are the uses of *ǵlm*, *ǵlmtm* (m. sg., f. du.) at KTU 1.119.7 and 8, where deities so designated are the recipients of sacrificial offerings. See also KTU 1.41.25.

100. Ug. *pḫr mʿd*. Pardee (1997c: 246 and n. 37): 'the Great Assembly'.

101. In the restored text (on the basis of l. 20) reading *ǵr ilˈl* rather than *ǵr ll*. Cf. del Olmo (1981a: 572), M.S. Smith (1986b) and Wyatt (1996b: 44; 1996c: 135-36).

102. The expression *al tpl al tštḫwy* can be construed in two opposed senses:

you shall honour the convocation of the [Council]!

[Standing upright[103], you shall then spe]ak,
declaring your message.

And you shall say to Bull [your] father [El],
[declare to the convocation of] the Council:

"Message of Yam, your master,
of your lord, R[uler Nahar]:

Give up the god whom you obey[104],
the one whom you obey, Tempest[105]!
Give up Baal [and his retinue],
the Son of Dagan[106], whose gold I shall seize!"'[107]

either as negative, 'do not...' or as asseverative, 'do indeed...'. For the former see Aistleitner (1964: 48), Ginsberg (1969: 130), Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 129 n. m: 'the envoys... are invited to show insolence'), de Moor (1987: 31), M.S. Smith (1994: 265, 288) and Pardee (1997c: 246); for the latter see Driver (1956: 79), Jirku (1962: 22), de Moor (1971a: 124), Gibson (1978: 40) and del Olmo (1981a: 169). I have taken it in the latter sense, since we expect them to be truculent, yet it is Baal's behaviour in ll. 38-42 that is precipitate and outrageous, contrasting with the messengers' proper decorum. This can be viewed from two angles: either Baal is a king-in-waiting, and therefore creates law rather than obeys it, or those who are in the wrong (that is, from the narrator's perspective, the messengers of Yam) always keep on the right side of the law! Cf. following note.

103. Ug. *qmm*: adv.? The basic sense is 'rising up', thus confirming the positive interpretation of the preceding expression.

104. As king among the gods, Yam's legal right to their obedience is beyond question. It is not clear why Baal is the god whom the others obey, unless they are plotting rebellion, perpetuating an older loyalty (see n. 56 to KTU 1.1 iv 24) or already anticipating future developments. The poet and his hearers know, of course, and the tetracolon is perhaps hymnic in origin.

105. Ug. *hmlt*: Wyatt (1992a: 412-15 [§13]). Cf. Heb. *hᵃmullâ*, 'storm', Akk. *ummilu*, 'disturber'. Other understandings: 'multitude(s)', Driver (1956: 79), Gibson (1978: 41), del Olmo (1981a: 170) and M.S. Smith (1994: 265); 'crowd', de Moor (1971a: 124; 1987: 31); 'living things', Aistleitner (1964: 49). Watson (1996a: 73) now cites Ar. *hamala* VII, 'pour down (rain)'. The form *hmlt* appearing in KTU 1.1 iii [15] and parallels is still appropriately translated 'multitudes', though the etymology may still be the same, alluding to the noise of a vast crowd of people.

106. For discussion of the title *bn dgn* see Wyatt (1980; 1992a: 408 [§6]; 1996b: 42 n. 44). I have adopted the more usual understanding in this edition. But cf. KTU 1.3 v 35!

107. For this analysis of the tetracolon, which employs four titles of Baal,

The divine assistants depart;
they do not delay.

T[hen]
1.2 i 20 they set their [faces] towards the divine mountain,
towards the convocation of the Council.

Now the gods were sitting to ea[t],
the sons of the Holy One to dine.

Baal stood by El.

Lo,
the gods saw them,
they saw the messengers of Yam,
the embassy of Ruler [Nahar].

The gods lowered their heads onto their knees,
and onto the thrones of their princeships.

Baal rebuked them:
1.2 i 25 'Why, O gods, have you lowered your heads onto your knees,
and onto the thrones of your princeships?

I see, gods,
that the tablets[108] of Yam's messengers,
of the embassy of Ruler Naha<r>, are humiliating (you)[109].

see Wyatt (1992a: 414-15 [§13]).

108. The message would be written on a cuneiform tablet, which the messengers would read. Even the gods conform to the diplomatic norm. It is presumably the text on the tablets, carrying Yam's demands (the 'Word of God'), which cows the gods, rather than the messengers themselves. Speech carries its own autonomous power in ancient thought. Cf. Isa. 55.11 and Jer. 1.9-12. It is summed up in such formulae as 'I am Alpha and Omega' (Rev. 1.8 etc.). To this cf. the Heb. *urim* and *tumnim*, as construed by Robertson (1964), playing on the merismic nature of aleph and taw.

109. The whole bicolon (here construed as having introductory anacrusis) is difficult. I take *aḥd* as 1 sg. G of *ḥdy* (Heb. *ḥāzâ*), 'I see', and *t'ny* as 3 du. or pl. D of *'ny*, 'humiliate'. This approach is taken by Driver (1956: 79), Jirku (1962: 22), Ginsberg (1969: 130) and del Olmo (1981a: 171). If *aḥd* is 'one' and √*'ny* 'answer', the following senses are understood: 'will any of the gods answer?' Gibson (1978: 41: vb and subj. disagree); 'alone I will answer', de Moor (1971a: 124; 1987: 33: the verb is not 1 p. sg.: de Moor has to correct to *a'ny*); 'one of the gods must answer', Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 130: vb and subj. disagree); 'in unison will the

Lift up, O gods, your heads from on your knees,
from the thrones of your princeships,

and I shall answer the messengers of Yam,
the embassy of Ruler Nahar.'

The gods raise their heads from on their knees,
from the thrones of their princeships.

1.2 i 30 When[110] the messengers of Yam arrived,
the embassy of Ruler Nahar,

at the feet of El they did indeed fall[111];
they did indeed honour the convocation of the Council.

Standing upright, they then spoke,
they [proclaimed] their message.

As a great blaze they appeared;
a sharpened sword was their [ton]gue.

They spoke to Bull his[112] father, El:

'Message of Yam, your[113] master,
of your lord, Ruler Nahar:

"Give up the god whom you obey,
1.2 i 35 the one whom you obey, [Tempe]st!
Give up Baal and his retinue,
the Son of Dagan, whose gold I shall seize!"'

And Bull, his father, El, replied:

'Baal is your slave, O Yam;
Baal is your slave, [Nahar].
The Son of Dagan is your prisoner:

he will bring you tribute like the gods;

gods answer', M.S. Smith (1994: 266) and Pardee (1997c: 246)—contradicted by the sequel. I have put the vb with the second colon for English style. It serves double duty in the first colon.

110. Translated thus on stylistic grounds. Lit. 'afterwards', 'after', adv. or conj. If so translated, to be construed as anacrusis.

111. The problem of whether *l* is negative or asseverative is to be resolved as with *al* in l. 15 above (n. 102).

112. Sc. Yam, on whose behalf they speak. Similarly in l. 36.

113. Ug. *b'lkm*, *adnkm*: 'your' includes all the assembled gods. No doubt the use of *b'lkm* is deliberately ironical in Baal's presence.

[ ] he will bring you offerings, like the sons of the Holy One.'

Then Prince Baal was enraged[114].

In his hand he [seiz]ed a knife,
in his right hand a weapon[115].

The divine assistants he [attacked?[116]].

1.2 i 40 His right hand A]nat seized;
his left hand Athtart seized.

'How could you smite [the messengers of Yam?[117]],
the embassy of Ruler Nahar?

The messenger cìas[ps][118] a noble's sceptre;
[[119]]
the messenger between his shoulders[120] (has) the word of his master
and [[121]].'

Then Prince Baal was enraged:

'The tendrils[122] of the v[ine]

114. Ug. *anš*. See Sznycer (1967), van Zijl (1975: 74-75; 1975b) and Caquot (1990).

115. Ug. *mšḫt...mḥṣ*. Van Selms (1970: 263) translates 'meat-hammer... slaughtering-knife': Baal grabs the instruments from the table.

116. Text *yš* [--]. Space for about two more letters. De Moor restores *yš*[*u*], 'he raised [a weapon]'. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 132 n. a) suggest either *yš*[*ql*], 'he fells' or *yš*[*ḫṭ*], 'he attacks'. M.S. Smith (1994: 268) suggests the latter.

117. The words *mlak.ym* are what we would expect in the lacuna beginning l. 41. However, after allowing for [*t*'] of [*t*']*dt*, there is insufficient room. Perhaps a word was omitted?

118. Text *yḫb*[ ]. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 132 n. b) propose *yḫb*[*š*]: 'attaches'. *KTU*^{2} reads *yḫb*[*q*], 'embraces'. Either is plausible.

119. There is room for up to four signs at the end of l. 41, and perhaps 5 at the beginning of l. 42.

120. A messenger would perhaps carry the tablet with the message in a distinctive pouch suspended from his neck.

121. A further 12 or so signs are missing in total at the end of l. 42 and the beginning of l. 43.

122. Ug. *šdmt*. See Wyatt (1992c). De Moor (1987: 34) interprets this in seasonal manner (dating it to January!). In KTU 1.23.10 the *šdmt* (not 'terraces' but 'tendrils') are shorn from El in what is a figurative description of a premarital rite of circumcision. See n. 12 *ad loc*. Thus *šdmt* is a metaphor for a foreskin. In view of

[ ] the messengers of Yam,
the embassy of Ruler Nahar.'

1.2 i 45 [Baal spoke,]
[he lifted up his voice and cried:]
'I say to Yam your master,
to your l[ord, Ruler Nahar]:
hear the word of Hadd the Avenger[123],
...'

1.2 ii (fragmentary, about 60 lines missing)

1.2 iii* (entire column missing, about 60 lines)[124]

1.2 iv 1 '[ ]
[ ]
[ ] I cannot drive out.
If I see[?] [ ]
and with Yam is the sieve of destruction[125].
By Yam I shall be worm-eaten[126] [ ]
[and thanks to] Nahar (devoured by) maggots.

this, are ll. 43-44 the first words of Baal's speech, before he gives a more measured answer in ll. 45-48? On this hypothesis, perhaps the tricolon is a coarse expletive, amounting to 'Balls to Yam!'

123. See Wyatt (1992a: 410 [§10]). The element *gmr* appears in various personal names: *UT*, 380 §19.592.

124. Not to be confused with the column now identified as 'KTU 1.2 iii', which I suggested should be 'iii b' to distinguish it from the rest of the separate tablet, treated above.

125. Ug. *mnḫlabd* (no word-dividers): construed by Gibson (1978: 43) as *mnḫl*, 'sieve' (Ar. *munḫulu*) and *abd*, 'destruction' (cf. Heb. *'abdān*, *'ᵃbaddôn*). Perhaps to be compared to the allusions in KTU 1.6 ii <34>, v 16 to a sieve (*kbrt*). 'My resting-place (repose) perished': de Moor (1971a: 126; 1987: 38). '...against Yam; I shall destroy his dwelling': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 134). 'And in Yam the calm suffered no diminution': del Olmo (1981a: 174). 'And in Yammu I will indeed destroy the resting place': Pardee (1997c: 248).

126. Ug. *irtm*. Construed as 1 sg. Gt of √*rmm*, 'be full of maggots', in view of parallel *tl'm* ('worms'), by de Moor (1971a: 133), followed by Dahood (1972: 340: §II 521). 'I shall tie': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 134: √*rtm*). 'Lungs (of death)': Gibson (1978: 43). Cf. 'breast (of death)': M.S. Smith (1994: 321).

There[127] with a sword I shall destroy,[128]
1.2 iv 5 I shall knock down[129] (his) [hou]ses[130].
Into the underworld will fall my strength,
and into the dust my power[131].'[132]
[From] his mouth his speech barely went[133] forth,
from his lips his word,

127. I take it that Baal speaks of destroying Yam when he is in the underworld. He is expecting to die. The similarity of Yam to Mot is apparent. Both are principles of chaos.

128. Ug. *its*. 'I shall (will) destroy': Bordreuil and Pardee (1993a: 63), and M.S. Smith (1994: 321, 332). Cf. Heb. √*nts*, *nṣ* and *ntś*. 'I was put (to the edge of the sword)': de Moor (1987: 38). 'Drawn are the swords (raised is the weapon)': Aistleitner (1964: 50).

129. Ug. *anšq*. Ug. *nšq* means 'weapon' (*WUS*: 216, §1867, Heb. *nešeq*: cf. *nṯq* at KTU 1.4 viii 39: 217, §1876): may this be a denom. vb, 'I shall strike'? 'I shall burn': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 135), Bordreuil and Pardee (1993a: 63) and M.S. Smith (1994: 321, 332). Cf. Heb. *nśq*, 'burn' (wrongly classified as *ślq* by BDB). But one does not burn with a sword! And hardly 'I shall (will, had to) kiss' (*WUS*: 216, §1866, Heb. *nāšaq*, Akk. *našāku*), as for Gibson (1978: 43) and de Moor (1987: 38).

130. The word is pl., if correctly restored. Virolleaud (1935a: 30): [*b*(?)]*h*(?)*tm*. Bordreuil and Pardee (1993a: 63): [*b*]*htm*. *KTU*^{2}: [p]i*tm*. This would be '(his two) temples'. M.S. Smith (1994: 319): [ ]*htm*. *CTA*: [-?]*htm*.

131. 'My strength...my power'. Ug. *ulny...'ẓmny*. So also del Olmo (1981a: 175: 'my/our...'). Gibson (1978: 43): 'The strength of us two...'. Bordreuil and Pardee (1993a: 63): 'the strong...the powerful'. Similarly M.S. Smith (1994: 322). Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 135 and n. k): 'the corpulent...the gigantic'.

132. Aistleitner (1964: 50), Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 135), Bordreuil and Pardee (1993a: 63), M.S. Smith (1994: 331) and Pardee (1997c: 248) interpret this difficult and damaged passage as a series of defiant threats uttered by Baal against Yam. It is an empty threat, however, for Baal is feeling sorry for himself, trussed up as a prisoner beneath Yam's throne. For del Olmo (1981a, p. 175), it is a narrative of Baal's violent response. For de Moor (1987: 38) it is a 1 p. narrative of Baal's submission. Ginsberg (1969: 130) has an unnamed goddess utter these words; de Moor (1987: 39 n. 173) and M.S. Smith (1994: 322) understand Athtart to be already present, and to speak in ll. 6-7. On the imagery of dust, mentioned so closely before Baal's rising up and triumphing over Yam, to obtain the kingship, see Brueggemann's important analysis (1972).

133. Ug. *lyṣa*. In the sense that he scarcely has the energy to speak. Alternatively, 'his speech had scarcely gone forth', with a sense of temporal immediacy. In this case the 'and' of l.6 would be translated by 'when'.

and he gave forth[134] his voice in groaning[135]
beneath the throne of Prince Yam.

And Kothar-and-Hasis spoke:

'Indeed I say to you, O Prince Baal,
I repeat, O Charioteer[136] of the Clouds,

now your foe, Baal,
now your foe you must smite;
now you must destroy your adversary!

1.2 iv 10 Take your everlasting kingdom,
your eternal dominion!'

Kothar fashioned[137] two maces[138],
and he pronounced their names:

'You, your name is "Expeller"[139].

134. Ug. *wttn*. Apparently 3 f. sg. in form, whence the introduction of Athtart or some other goddess by various commentators (see n. 132 above). Either correct to *wytn*, making Baal the subj. as above (cf. del Olmo [1981a: 175], proposing *ntn* or *tn*, after Gibson [1978: 43 n. 6]). Gibson (1978: 43) translates: 'the utterance of his voice'—prosodically unlikely. Impersonal vb: Aistleitner (1964: 51): 'a rumbling was heard', similarly Bordreuil and Pardee (1993a: 63).

135. Ug. *ygr*. 'Groan': *WUS* 133, §1208, *UT* 465, §19.1985. 'Sink down', √*ǵwr*, Ar. *ǵâra*: Gibson (1978: 43, 155). Cf. de Moor (1971a: 126, 134; 1987: 39). 'Be enraged': Driver (1956: 165, Ar. *waǵru*, but not p. 81, 'sank').

136. Ug. *rkb*. 'Charioteer' rather than 'rider': Wyatt (1992a: 420-22 [§20]). The chariot itself would be the clouds.

137. Ug. *ynḥt*. See Tropper (1995): 'carve out'; R.M. Good (1985): 'fashioned', and identification of two radicals. 'Fetched down' (Gibson 1978: 43, 152), with ref. to Aram. *nḥēt*, 'descended'. Cf. Heb. *nāḥēt* pi. This approach understands Kothar to bring the weapons *down* to where Baal is, sc. beneath Yam's throne. The point is rather Kothar's manufacture of the weapons, which ensures their efficacy. Cf. his other constructional work: furniture and accoutrements for Athirat (KTU 1.4 i 23-43), the palace-temple for Baal (allusively in KTU 1.4 v 36 vi 35) and the bow for Aqhat (allusively in KTU 1.17 i 1-33).

138. Ug. *ṣmd*, here du. *ṣmdm*. 'Maces', 'clubs' or 'axes'? Cf. KTU 1.65.14. On divine weapons see del Olmo (1992d), Durand (1993), Bordreuil and Pardee (1993a: 67-68), M.S. Smith (1994: 339) and Wyatt (1998a). The precise identity is not certain, beyond the probability that the head of the weapon was 'bound' (*ṣmd*, Ar. *ḍamada*) to the haft. For other etymologies see M.S. Smith (1994: 338-39). He himself (p. 322) reserves judgment: 'weapons'. 'Kothar forged two axes': Wyatt (1996b: 136).

139. Ug. *ygrš*, lit. 'he expels' or 'let him expel'. The role of the weapon is indi-

Expeller, expel Yam,
expel Yam from his throne,
Nahar from the siege of his dominion!

You must leap from the hand of Baal,
like a falcon[140] from his fingers.

Strike the shoulders of Prince Yam,
1.2 iv 15 the chest[141] of [Rul]er Nahar!'

The mace leapt from the hand of Baal,
like a falcon from his fingers.

It struck the shoulders of Prince Yam,
the chest of Ruler Nahar.

But Yam was strong:
he did not flinch[142].

His joints did not tremble;
his visage was not discomposed.

Kothar fashioned two maces,
and he pronounced their names:[143]

cated in its name. The giving of the name transmits the quality to the weapon, as in the case of naming people.

140. Ug. *nšr*. 'Falcon' rather than 'eagle', unless it is supposed that the gods used eagles for falconry, in keeping with their heroic stature. Claims that falconry was not practised in the second millennium BCE (e.g. Reiter 1990) are frustrated by this passage and the episode in KTU 1.18 iv 17 and n. 51, whatever the species. See M.S. Smith (1994: 343-44). Ar. *nasr*, *nisr*, means 'eagle' or 'vulture', and perhaps generically 'raptor', 'bird of prey'.

141. Ug. *bn ydm*: lit. 'between the two hands'. That is, on the back, || *ktp* (lit. 'flat blade'), here scapula(e), or front, by extension of the 'flatness' motif to the front of the body. Cf. M.S. Smith (1994: 323): 'torso... between the hands', Wyatt (1996b: 136): 'trunk...chest', sc. the front rather than the back. On the expression *bn ydm*, see Loewenstamm (1971a: 96-97). Blows on the front would be more probable than on the back with two opponents. Cf. the interchange between Siward and Ross in *Macbeth* V vii: 'Had he his hurts before?' 'Ay, on the front'.

142. Ug. *ymk* (√*mwk*). Lit. 'did not become low'. The idea is of reeling from the blow, or cowering, rather than falling.

143. While this general introduction to the fashioning of two weapons makes sense at l. 11 above, it reads decidedly oddly in translation at this point. It is a rather mechanical use of a formula, without regard to the internal logic of the narrative. Perhaps in translation we should adjust: 'Kothar fashioned a second mace | and he pronounced its name'.

'You, your name is "All-Driver"[144].

All-Driver, drive Yam away,
1.2 iv 20 drive Yam from his throne,
Nahar from the siege of his dominion!

You must leap from the hand of Baal,
like a falcon from his fingers.

Strike the skull of Prince Yam,
the brow[145] of Ruler Nahar!

Let Yam collapse in a heap,
and let him fall to the ground!'

Then the mace leapt from the hand of Baal,
like a falcon from his fingers.

It struck the skull of Prince Yam,
1.2 iv 25 the brow of Ruler Nahar.

Yam collapsed in a heap;
he fell to the ground.

His joints trembled,
and his visage was discomposed.

Baal gathered up[146]
and drank <Prince>[147] Yam to the dregs[148];

144. Ug. *aymr*, explained as *ay* + *mr* (√*mry*), 'All-driving', 'Let it drive everything' (cf. M.S. Smith 1994: 343).

145. Ug. *bn 'nm*, lit. 'between the eyes'. Note the matching pattern in ll. 14, 21-2. See Avishur (1980). Cf. the same expression at KTU 1.3 vi 3.

146. Ug. *yqṯ*. Or perhaps 'collected him together': the idea is of collecting chaff, a mirror image of Anat's treatment of Mot (KTU 1.6 ii 30-37). Or 'dried up' (sc. reduce to chaff), but this does not fit the drinking image. Yam is splattered about (a mixture of water-imagery and battlefield butchery). For both approaches cf. Heb. √*qšš*, T *qešaš* (cit. BDB, 905 '[orig. *be dried up*?]'). 'Stoop': Margalit (1982a: 82-83 [note his previous discussion 1979–80: 82-83]), on the same etymology: 'gleaning movement'. Usually translated 'drag' (Ar. *qaṭ ṭa*): de Moor (1971a: 127; 1987: 41), Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 138), Gibson (1978: 44), del Olmo (1981a: 177) and M.S. Smith (1994: 323, 351-52). 'Rend': Ginsberg (1969: 131). The same √ occurs at KTU 1.114.5. See n. 13 *ad loc*.

147. The *zbl* requires to be restored here, in contrast to the usage above (KTU 1.2 i 6-7 and n. 87).

148. Ug. *yšt*. 'Drank': Margalit (1982a: 82: √*šty*, or 'dried up', √*nšt*). 'Dismembered': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 138), Ar. *šatta*, 'separate, throw about',

he exterminated Ruler Nahar.
By name Athtart chided[149] (him):
'Dry (him) up[150]. O Valiant Baal!

citing Obermann (1947: 205). Similarly M.S. Smith (1994: 323, 352-53) and Pardee (1997c: 249). 'Laid him down': Gibson (1978: 44; n. 9 'possibly "drank him down"'). 'Reduced': del Olmo (1981a: 177).

149. Ug. *tg'rm* (√*g'r*). Lit. 'she rebuked (him)', but the point is hardly to criticize Baal, but to exhort him to complete the task. On this vb see McCurley (1983: 46-52). For van Selms (1970: 266 n. 33, citing Macintosh 1969), tentatively wishing to make Athtart Yam's wife (cf. the Eg. myth of Ashtart and the tribute of the sea, *ANET*, 17-18) it is precisely a rebuke. But this would hardly fit the sense of the following bicolon. Athtart, here presumably paired with Anat (cf. KTU 1.2 i 40 above) also embodies traits of a war-goddess (and huntress: KTU 1.92). In Eg. iconography she appears on horseback or in a chariot, with weapons (see Leclant 1960). The character of the goddesses may perhaps be compared with that of camp-followers screaming defiance and insults at the enemy and shouting encouragement to their own men-folk. The present single combat is strictly a stylized act of war. The term is used of the porter in KTU 1.114.11.

150. Ug. *bṯ*. Imper. of *ybṯ*. To be explained as √*ybṯ*, cf. Heb. *yābēš*, Ar. *yabasa*, 'dry up'. (Ug. *ṯ* = Ar. *s* may be considered a problem, but Ug. *ṯdṯ* = Ar. *sadisa*). Other suggestions are 'shame' (√*bwṯ*, Heb. *bûš*): Driver (1956: 82), Ginsberg (1969: 131), van Selms (1970: 266), del Olmo (1981a: 177) and de Moor (1971a: 127; 1987: 41); 'hail!' or 'destroy': Aistleitner (1964: 52; *WUS*, §609); or 'tear apart': Jirku (1962: 25); or 'scatter' (√*bṯ ṯ*, Ar. *baṯ ṯa*): Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 139), Gibson (1978: 44), Xella (1982: 88), M.S. Smith (1994: 324) and Pardee (1997c: 249). Drying up is consistent with drinking (*wyšt*, l. 27), but none of the other options is. Margaret Barker has drawn my attention to a remarkable bicolon at Isa. 19.5, which strikingly confirms the approach adopted here, and again illustrates the fidelity at least of theme and often of vocabulary, with which the Heb. preserves the Ug. tradition:

w^{e}ništû-mayim mēhayyām	And drunk are the waters (of) {from} Sea,
w^{e}nahar yeḥ^{e}rab w^{e}yābēš	and River is dehydrated {and dried up}.

The text is that of MT; the translation incorporates the points outlined below. The second colon is overloaded (imbalance between cola: the pattern should be a:b::b1:a1). The precise nuance of *yeḥ^{e}rab* is not easy to determine, since it opens up three possibilities, depending on the radical chosen. See discussion at Wyatt (1996b: 85-86) where I have considered the sense of *yeḥ^{e}rāb* in Ps. 106.9, and concluded that it is √*ḥrb* III, 'attack, smite down', rather than *ḥārēb* I or II, 'be dry'. Here it is understood to be either of these (I or II), and is either glossed by, or is a gloss on, *yābēš*. If the latter, then the same vb is used in the Ug. and Heb. texts. That it is this rather than √ III is required by the parallelism. Note that while 'drinking' is a normal fate for water, 'drying up' is an explicit *negation* of its

Dry (him) up, O Charioteer of the Clouds!
For our captive is Pr[ince Yam],
1.2 iv 30 [for] our captive is Ruler Nahar!'
Then B[aal] went out [ ]
Valiant Baal dried him up,
and [ ]
'Yam is indeed dead!
Baal will rul[e]'

(7 unintelligible lines, followed by gap)

essence. Note that the article should be omitted from *hayyām* (as it is before *nahar*), yielding the binomial Yam-Nahar of Ugaritic usage. I have also suggested in the translation the omission of the *mē-*, but this is uncertain. Note the miniature chiasmus *mym...ym*.

KTU 1.3–1.4: Baal's Palace

1.3 i (about 25 lines missing)

'...

1.3 i 1 Do not lower [ ]'

Radaman[1] served Vali[ant] Baal;
he waited on the Prince, Lord of Earth.

1.3 i 5 he arose and served,
and gave him to eat:

he carved a breast in his presence,
with a jaw-shaped knife[2] fillets of fatling.

He busied himself and poured,
and gave him to drink:

1.3 i 10 he put a cup in his hands,
a goblet[3] in both his hands—

a great chalice, mighty to behold,
a drinking-vessel[4] of the inhabitants[5] of heaven,

1. Text *prdmn*. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 153) take as one word, and consider it a name of Hurrian formation in *-enni*. Others treat the *p* as copula (*UT* 465, §19.1991 and *WUS* 251, §2178) followed by the name, which is compared with Gk Rhadamanthys: thus de Moor (1987: 2 n. 9). On Rhadamanthys see Graves (1960: I, 294). Gibson cites Akk. Radmānu (Tallqvist [1938: 185]). He appears to be a minor deity here. Pardee (1988b: 1; cf. 1997c: 249 n. 68) takes *prdmn* to be part of the preceding syntactic unit. See also Astour 1998.

2. Ug. *ḥrb mlḫt*. Explained by Chenet (1939–40) with reference to *lḥ* (= Heb. *leḥî*), 'jaw', as with the curved blade of a harpe (= *ḥrb*!). Several bronze harpes have been recovered from Ugarit. Archaeologically, the harpe is derived from flint-in-wood sickles, and even elegantly chiselled flint ones, themselves undoubtedly modelled on jawbones. See Gopher and Tsuk (1991: xvii, xxxiv). Preferable to 'salted' (*mlḥ* = Heb. *melaḥ*): thus Gibson (1978: 46), de Moor (1987: 3) and Pardee (1988b: 2). 'Good': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 154 n. h), with same etymology.

3. Ug. *krpn*, a term surviving in 'carafe'.

4. 'To behold, a drinking-vessel': text *ridn*, separated as *ri* (cf. **r'y*, Heb. *rā'â*), *dn* (Ar., Akk. *dannu*). Thus Gibson (1978: 46), del Olmo (1981a: 179), Xella (1982: 97) and de Moor (1987: 3). Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 155 n. m) treat it as one word, and take it to be the name of the cup ('Ra'idân'). On the indivisibility of *ridn* see Dietrich and Loretz (1987b: 27 n. 3) and Watson (1988: 50).

5. Ug. *mt*: lit 'people, men'. Perhaps 'of heroic size'? 'Furnishings': Pardee (1997c: 250).

a holy cup, which women might not see,
1.3 i 15 a goblet which (even) a wife[6] could not look upon[7].
A thousand measures[8] it took from the winevat,[9]
ten thousand (draughts) it took[10] from the barrel.
He arose, intoned and sang,
the cymbals in the minstrel's hands;
1.3 i 20 he sang, the chorister of beautiful voice,
concerning Baal in the uttermost parts of Saphon.
Baal contemplated his daughters:
he looked at Pidray[11] the daughter of Light[12]

6. Ug. *aṯrt*: following the etymology of Margalit 1990. Or (as others): 'Athirat'. But 'wife' provides a better parallel to *aṯt* in previous colon. See also next note.

7. The rationale behind such a cultic restriction may have been that as women menstruated, they were always in danger of ritual pollution. If the institution of the *Marziḥu* (cf. KTU 1.114; 1.3 i 9) lies behind the imagery, membership of this appears to have been restricted to men. (In this case, why are Anat and Athtart present? Perhaps as virgin huntresses, they are supposedly free of this polluting restriction. This is hard to square with Anat's activity in KTU 1.10 iii and 1.11, but in 1.13.31 she apparently bears without conceiving, thus preserving her virginity.) However, there is no question of the present scene being of this kind, since Baal evidently eyes his daughter-wives a few lines later. But this leaves the point about the restriction concerning the presence of women and goddess quite unresolved, except that while it is quite possible that women were excluded from some ritual procedures, goddesses could hardly be.

8. Ug. *kd*. Lit. 'jugs'. Cf. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 155 n. o).

9. Ug. *ḫmr*. The same term occurs at KTU 1.23.6, and is to be read at KTU 1.15 iv 23, v 6. Del Olmo (1992: 128) reads it at KTU 1.108.10. It is not 'new wine' (cf. de Moor 1971a: 78) but rather the container holding wine (Dahood 1964: 408-409; 1972: 186 §II 199). On del Olmo's approach, it could mean the contents of the vat, by extension.

10. Ug. *ymsk*. Lit. 'mixed'. I take the cup to be the subject: this is a measure of its capacity.

11. Ug. *pdry*. 'Fatty' (cf. Heb. *peder*) or 'Cloudy' (cf. Milik 1958: 252-54, citing Astour 1969: 11), but not 'Thunder' (cf. Dussaud 1932: 292 n. 6; Virolleaud 1938: 10; Ginsberg 1969: 131 n. 12: 'Flashie, Lightningette' and Astour 1969: 10). To this name cf. Gk Phaedra (*Phaidra*: Astour 1967: 267 n. 1), Pandrosos ('All-Bedewing'), with Erse (*Ersē*, [Ug. *arṣy*]) and Aglauros a daughter of Cecrops: Astour (1969) and Pandora ('All-Gifts', Harrison 1955: 280-85); as an earth-goddess Pandora may also be compared to Arṣiy (qv. col. iii l. 7). Pidray is identified with Hur. Ḫebat (van der Toorn [1995], consort of Baal's Hur. counterpart Teshup)

1.3 i 25 and also at Taliy[13] the daugh[ter] of Shower.
Pidra<y>?[14] certainly [kne]w
whether the [perfec]t brides [ ]

(about 14 lines missing)

1.3 ii (about 25 lines missing)
[Virgin Anat]
1.3 ii 1 [like a kid]
the perfumes of seven tamarisks[15],
the odour of coriander
and murex.[16]
Anat closed the doors of the house
1.3 ii 5 and she met the divine assistants at the foot of the mountain.
And lo,
Anat fought in the valley;

in KTU 1.47.17 = KTU 1.118.16 = RS 20.24.16. These combinations invite a comparison between Eve (*ḥavvah*, **ḥavvat*, cf. *Ḥebat*!) and Pandora, the more tempting as the latter becomes a primal woman in later tradition. Akk. ^{d}*Pi-id-di-r*[*i-ya*] appears as an epithet of Ishtar: Deimel (1914: §2988), Virolleaud (1938: 9 n. 1), van der Toorn (1995: col. 745). (If the name Pandora *is* related to Ug. *pdry*, its Gk explanation will be a later folk-etymology.)

12. Or: 'dawn' according to Astour (1969: 11). Pardee (1988b: 3): 'dew'.

13. To this name, *ṭly*, 'Dewy', from *ṭl* (Heb. *ṭal*), 'dew', cf. Gk *Thalia*, the muse of comedy.

14. Is the *y* missing through haplography, or is *pdr* another (m.) deity?

15. Ug. *bnt*, restored on the basis of KTU 1.7.35, is probably to be explained with reference to Akk. *bīnu*, Syr. *bīnā*, 'tamarisk'; cf. Akk. *bīnitu*, 'tamarisk wood', *AHw*, 126-27. Cf. *CAD*, II, 238. A translation such as 'daughters' does not fit. See n. 8 to KTU 1.124.8. Cf. the different construction by Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 157), 'seven young girls wiped her', to preserve this sense. Del Olmo (1981: 180) similar. Gibson (1978: 47): 'henna enough for seven girls'. De Moor (1987: 5): 'the seven girls (put) henna (on her)'. The seven tamarisks may have been different varieties whose oils were blended.

16. The identity of *anhbm* is not certain. But it appears to be a maritime product. I have followed *DLU*, 38. Cf. also de Moor (1968: 214-15) and Renfroe (1992: 80-81). It is hard to imagine that the *odour* of murex (dead) was pleasant! It is better construed, as here, with the tamarisk and coriander in parallel as sources of scent, and the murex following as a source of coloration.

she battled between the two towns.[17]

She smote the people of the sea-shore[18];
she destroyed the men of the sunrise.

Beneath her like balls were hea[ds];
1.3 ii 10 above[19] her like locusts[20] were palms[21],
like grasshoppers[22] heaps[23] of palms of warriors.

17. There is no need to give this a strictly geographical location (such as between Ugarit and Minet el Beida [ancient Mahadu, Ug. *mḫd*]), as supposed for example by de Moor (1971a: 94 n. 3; 1987: 5 n. 25). As war-goddess Anat would no doubt in theory be quite impartial in her visitation of misery on all combatant armies. She revels in destruction for its own sake. Cf. KTU 1.13.7 [14], where 'your warriors' appear to be soldiers in the goddess's service (sc. warriors), not just *enemy* soldiers. Thus the two towns would represent any two communities at war. There seems to be a broad cosmological scenic representation here, with Anat descending a mountain, presumably Aruru (KTU 1.10 iii 29-30) or Inbubu (cf. KTU 1.13.9-10), parts of the Saphon massif, involving two towns in the plain below, with further references to the limits of the world, the sea and the sunrise. Thus the scene is the paradigm of the war-goddess's martial role.

18. Ug. *ḫp y*[*m*]. Text reads *ḫp y*[ ], where only one set of strokes of the *y* survive (visible as *ḫ*). Most interpret *ḫp ym* as 'sea-shore': (Heb. *ḥôp yām*). See de Moor (1971a: 88; 1987: 5), Driver (1956: 85, 140 and n. 6: Ar. *ḫifāfu* [cit. as *-â-*], Akk. *ḫâpu*) and del Olmo (1981a: 181, 553; Ar. *ḫayfu*, *ḫifāfu*). The sea-shore is the west, while the *ṣat špš*, the 'emergence of the sun', is the east. However, despite their translation, Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 158 n. i) recognize the problem, since Ar. *ḥafa* corresponds to Heb. *ḥôp*. See also Lloyd (1994: 158 and n. 22). Driver's cognates seem to make these reservations unnecessary. The same term appears in KTU 1.23.30 (reading *ḫ'p ym* rather than *gp ym*). The merismus of the bicolon means 'all men from east to west'.

19. Or 'about'. She no doubt wore them strapped to her clothes, and perhaps in garlands around her neck.

20. The image is one of huge numbers.

21. Body-counts were achieved in antiquity by severing the right hands (the weapon hand) of the dead. Occasionally penises were severed, since circumcision could indicate ethnicity. Cf. 1 Sam. 18.25-27. Examples of both are shown in reliefs at Medinat Habu.

22. Ug. *qṣm*. The parallel *irbym* requires something like a grasshopper. Cf. Ar. *qaṣām*, Aram. *qamṣā*, 'locust' (Ar. *qamaṣa*, 'hop, jump'). See de Moor (1971a: 90-91). His later version, 'like scales of a plane-tree' (1987: 5), is far less convincing. Cf. Driver (1956: 85) and Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 159 n. l) for similar phytological treatments. For a further example of a simile between an army and a swarm of locusts see Joel 2.3-11.

23. Ug. *ǵrmn*. Driver (1956: 85, 142 n. 28: Ar. *'arrama*, 'heaped up', but ' is not

She fixed heads to her back;
she attached palms to her girdle.

Her knees she stee[ped] in the blood of soldiers;
1.3 ii 15 her thighs[24] in the gore[25] of warriors.

With shafts[26] she drove out the old men[27];
with the string of her bow the townsfolk[28].

And lo,
Anat came to her house;
the goddess went down to her palace[29].

ǵ), 'piled in heaps' (cf. Heb. *ʿarēmâ*, 'heap'); similarly del Olmo (1981a: 181): 'in a swarm'. Gibson (1978: 47, 155: Ar. *ǵarima*, 'paid a debt'): 'avenging'.

24. Ug. *ḥlqm*. The term is du. from √*ḥlq*, 'divide', and may denote 'thighs' or 'buttocks' (thus de Moor 1971a: 88, 92; 1987: 6). Less convincingly 'skirts' (MHeb. *ḥālūq*, 'underwear'): Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 159), Gibson (1978: 47). 'Neck': Pardee (1997c: 250).

25. Ug. *mmʿ*. 'Gore' (Ar. *māʿa*, 'flow'): Gibson (1978: 47, 151). 'Entrails': del Olmo (1981a: 181: Ar. *māʿa*, and Heb. *mēʿâ*: entrails). I have chosen the former on prosodic grounds: 'blood...gore' is a better parallel. Hardly 'pus' or other such bodily secretions (Caquot and Sznycer 1974: 159).

26. Ug. *mṭm*. Lit. 'with (a) rod(s)'. Reasonably interpreted as arrows in the light of the following colon. De Moor (1987: 7) translates 'staff', and has Anat use the stave of her bow as a cudgel in the following colon. But *ksl* is rather 'tendon' and therefore 'bow-string', fitting the bow of the following colon (l. 16). Watson (1976c: 373) draws attention to this, since it was over a bow, subsequently destroyed, that Anat had Aqhat murdered. Had she recovered it or obtained a substitute in the missing end of the story? There is no need to think that it was the same bow. Driver (1956: 85, 160 and n. 30), 'tottering', of the old men (Heb. *mûṭ*).

27. Ug. *šbm*. 'Old men': cf. Heb. *śāb*: Gibson (1978: 47, 158). These, with the women and children of the town (*mdnt*) would be non-combatants, caught up in Anat's enactment of total war. Lloyd (1994: 159): 'captives' (Heb. *śᵉbî*). But see Virolleaud (1938: 19 n. 2). Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 159): 'young men' (Ar. *šabb*). Discussion and further references in de Moor (1971a: 92). '(potential) captors': Pardee (1997c: 250).

28. 'Opponents': Pardee (1997c: 250).

29. Or 'temple': the cultic overtones are paramount here. Sc. Anat's temple. No such temple is known. Anat may have had a shrine on Mt Saphon or its subordinate summit Inbubu, though the narrative here oscillates confusingly between mountain-and-valley and urban setting. Saadé (1979) has identified the following temples at Ugarit: the palace chapel ('Hurrian sanctuary') (p. 115), the Baal and Dagan temples (pp. 133-41), a possible anonymous temple (pp. 146-47), sanctuaries at Mahadu (Minet el Beida) (p. 151) and temples of Athtart and Reshef (textual allusions) (p. 179). The 'temple aux rhytons' was discovered after he had published.

But she was not sated with her fighting in the valley,
1.3 ii 20 (nor her) battling between the towns.

She set chairs for warriors,
she put tables for armies,
footstools for heroes.

Fiercely[30] she fought and looked;
Anat battled and considered.

1.3 ii 25 Her liver shook with laughter;
her heart was filled with joy,
the liver of Anat with triumph,

as she steeped her knees in the blood of soldiers,
her thighs in the gore of warriors;

until she was sated she fought in the house,
1.3 ii 30 she battled between the tables.

From the house the blood of soldiers was wiped clean;
oil of peace was poured into[31] a bowl.

Virgin Anat washed her hands,
her fingers the Beloved of the Powerful One[32].

[She] washed her hands of[33] the blood of warriors,
1.3 ii 35 her [fin]gers of the gore of soldiers.

She [set] the chairs in order,
the tables in rows.
Footstools she set by footstools.[34]

30. Ug. *mid*. Lit. 'much'.

31. Or 'from'. I have translated the vb as passive, because Anat can hardly be the subj. Cf. KTU 1.16 iii 1; 1.101.14.

32. Ug. *ybmt limm* (var. *ymmt limm*). On this epithet and this explanation see Wyatt (1992a: 417-19 §17). A kinship explanation (see Walls 1992: 94-107) seems to offer no theological significance.

33. Ug. *b*. 'Of, free of' rather than 'in' (as for Pardee 1997c: 251). Unless we are to imagine Anat engaging in a particularly ghoulish washing in the blood and gore of her victims before the lustrations which follow. But against this see l. 31.

34. In the preceding scene Anat has acted as the war-goddess, indeed as the personification of war itself. Her glee is the personification of the frenzy of the warrior and the removal of all social restraints. Those killed are not necessarily just the enemies of Ugarit, but the troops of both sides in a battle (n. 17 above). Why does she engage in two battles, the second of a theatrical kind? See Lloyd (1996) for the interesting theory that the first is a 'real' battle (that is, war as actually conducted),

She drew water and she washed herself,
(with) dew of heaven,
oil of earth,
1.3 ii 40 the rain of the [Char]ioteer of the Clouds,
dew which heaven poured on her,
[rai]n with which the stars anointed her.
1.3 iii 1 She made herself beautiful with murex
whose source is [a thousand acres] in the sea,
[ ][35]

(about 20 lines missing)

[He took his lyre in his hand,]
1.3 iii 5 [he] clasped the bull-shaped instrument[36] to his breast,
singing[37] of the loves of Valiant Baal,

while the second is its ensuing ritual counterpart, carried on in the temple to resolve the conflicts which war has raised. Here prisoners would be killed under controlled, and therefore ideal conditions, the world ritually put to rights, and the whole untidy mess purified by cultic procedures. On the principle of ritual serving this function see J.Z. Smith (1981: 124-25).

35. Lines 1-3 occur on a small fragment (RS 2.[014]), quite detached from the rest of KTU 1.3. The same fragment supplies the closing lines of col. iv. (See Virolleaud 1938: Pll. II, VI; *CTA*, Figs. 8 [bottom], 11 [top], pll. IV, V).

36. Ug. [-]*št rimt*. In KTU 1.7.22, which appears to be a quotation of this line, the vb is f., *tšt*, but the context following here requires a m. sense. Is it to be corrected to *m*[!]*št*? See next n. The singer at KTU 1.3 i 18-22 is m. Cf. also KTU 1.17 vi 32-33. Cf. however at KTU. 1.101.17-18, where it is apparently Anat who serenades Baal, while in KTU 1.16 i 29, 39, I have rendered *ṯtmnt*, the putative name of Keret's daughter, as 'the lyre-player', explained at n. 155 to KTU 1.15 iii 12. On *rimt*, which perhaps alludes to a bull's head on the sounding-box of a harp, such as the one discovered at Ur, see Watson (1996a: 78). Note also the discussion by Pardee (1988a: 151 and n. 179). The term may alternatively allude to the material (sc. bull-horn) from which the instrument is made, or even to an instrument formed of the entire bull's skull, with the horns providing the frame. Ug. *rim*, Akk. *rêmu*, Heb. *rᵉʾēm*, means 'aurochs, wild bull'. Since the term *rimt* occurs in parallel to *knr*, 'lyre', it is not to be translated as 'harp' or any instrument other than a lyre, but is rather to be seen as further defining *knr*. I have attempted to reflect this need in my version.

37. The pt. is m. (*mšr*), while the preceding vb is usually restored as f. on the basis of KTU 1.7.22 (previous n.). *KTU*[2]: t]št (in Roman). Cf. Virolleaud (1938: 29): *m*(?)*št* (sc. *m*[?]*št*). Since the minstrel is male in col. i, it seems likely that the

the desire of Pidray daughter of Light,
the affection of Taliy daughter of Shower,
the love[38] of Arṣiy[39] daughter of Snatcher-for-ever[40].

'As divine assistants enter in[41];

1.3 iii 10 at the feet of Anat bow and fall down;
pay her homage and honour her,

and speak to Virgin Anat,
say to the Beloved of the Powerful One:

"Message of Valiant Baal,
word of Valiant Warrior[42]:

same is the case here. There are after all 20 lines of text missing following the last mention of Anat in col. iii 1. The singer is Anat according to Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 159 n. b: they correct the vb to *tšr*), Gibson (1978: 48), de Moor (1987: 8) and Lloyd (1994: 166); and in the following lines it is possible to imagine the messengers interrupting Anat's singing. I have taken it that the singing is going on while Baal gives his messengers their instructions, and therefore not in Anat's presence. She reacts from afar to their approach later, in col. iii 32-35. An appeal to KTU 1.101.16-17 (where Anat apparently sings—cf. n. 17 *ad loc.*) may be countered with an appeal to the more immediate text, KTU 1.3 i 20.

38. 'Desire...affection...love': Ug. *yd, ahbt, dd.* All the terms probably carry specifically sexual overtones.

39. Cf. Gk *Ersē.* The Ug. *arṣy*, epithetal from *arṣ*, here 'earth' = 'underworld'. The third of the triad. The Gk goddesses here named are evidently of WS origin. See Astour (1969). In KTU 1.47.23 = KTU 1.118.22 = RS 20.24.22, Arṣiy is identified with Allatum, that is, Ereshkigal, goddess of the underworld in the Babylonian pantheon.

40. Ug. *y'bdr.* 'Snatcher-for-Ever' (evidently m. form) I take to be an epithet of Mot. For this explanation, construing as *y'b* + *dr*, see Astour (1969: 13): he cites Ar. *wa'aba*, 'take (everything)'. De Moor (1971: 84), pursuing the seasonal argument, translates '(the girl of) the ample flowing', citing Ar. *wa'b*, 'wide, vast', *wa 'ib*, 'ample', and Ar. *darra*, 'flow copiously'. Cf. del Olmo (1981a: 560), 'spring'. 'Wide world', and so on: Driver (1956: 165 and n. 21), citing Ar. *wa 'iba*, 'was spacious' and Ar. *dauru*, 'circuit' or *dâru*, 'house, court, country'.

41. Text *km ǵlmm w 'rbn.* The presence of the copula *w* suggests that something has been omitted, and the evident comparison supports this. Perhaps something like:

|...| as divine assistants
and enter in

is to be understood.

42. On the title *aliy qrdm* see Wyatt (1992a: 405 §2).

'Bury war in the earth;
set strife in the dust:

pour a libation into the midst of the earth,
honey from a jar into the midst of the steppe.

Grasp your spear (and) your mace:

let your feet hasten towards me,
let your legs hurry to me!

For I have a word that I would say to you,
a message that I would repeat to you:

a word of tree and whisper of stone,

the sighing of the heavens to the earth,
of the deep to the stars,

I understand the thunder
which the heavens do not know,

a word unknown to men,
and which the multitudes of the earth do not understand.

Come,
and I shall reveal it
in the midst of my divine mountain, Saphon,
in the sanctuary[43],

on the mountain of my inheritance,
in Paradise[44], on the height of victory.[45]'''

Lo,
Anat caught sight of the (two) gods.

At this her feet trembled;

43. This language is clearly cultic, identifying a sanctuary (probably in Ugarit) with the cosmic mountain.

44. Cf. Wyatt (1996b: 40).

45. The double line scored across the tablet at this juncture seems to refer the reader back to a formulaic passage omitted here. See the instruction written in such a context after KTU 1.4 i 43, v 41 and the single line after l. 43. Cf. also at KTU 1.4 viii 45. *Contra* de Moor (1987: 10 n. 53), I take it that what is missing here is a brief statement that the messengers departed and approached Anat. 'Height': Ug. *gb'*. Cf. KTU 1.10 iii 28 n. 32. Elsewhere *ṣrrt*, 'uttermost parts' is used, as at KTU 1.4 v 55.

her tendons[46] snapped about her.

Above, her face sweated,
1.3 iii 35 the tendons of her back contracted,
(as did) the muscles[47] of her shoulders.

She lifted up her voice and cried:

'Why have Gupan and Ugar come?

What manner of enemy has arisen against Baal,
of foe against the Charioteer of the Clouds?

Surely I smote the Beloved of El, Yam?
Surely I exterminated Nahar, the mighty god?

1.3 iii 40 Surely I lifted up[48] the dragon,
I overpowered him?

I smote the writhing serpent,
Encircler[49]-with-seven-heads!

I smote the Beloved of El, Arsh[50],

46. Ug. *ksl*. Cf. this term as bow-string in KTU 1.3 ii 16. 'Loin' (*WUS* 154, §1357), del Olmo (1981a: 567): Heb. *kesel*, Aram. *kislā*, Ar. *kislu*, Akk. *kaslu*.

47. Ug. *anš*. 'Moving part of the body': *WUS* 28, §320. 'Muscle, tendon': *DLU*, 41. Hardly to be compared to Heb. *nāšê* (thus del Olmo 1981a: 515), 'sciatic nerve'! Taken as a vb: '(her spine) goes weak': Pardee (1997c: 252).

48. Ug. *lištbm*, √*šbm*. Lifting him up bodily (as in wrestling?) indicates Anat's superior strength. See Barr (1973) and Day (1985: 14 n. 32). Cf. KTU 1.83.8. Against this view see Pardee (1984; 1997c: 252 and n. 92): 'I have bound the dragon's jaws'.

49. Ug. *šlyṭ*, as at KTU 1.5 i 3. I follow the proposal of Margalit (1980: 90) to explain this as Š of √*lwṭ* (cf. Heb. *lwṭ*, 'enwrap, envelop'). As an epithet for a dragon this is preferable to 'tyrant' (*šlṭ*: Watson 1977: 274-75; del Olmo 1981a: 629; *WUS* 306, §2612: Akk. *šalaṭu*, Ar. *saliṭa*, Eth. *šalaṭa*, Heb. *šālaṭ* [cf. *šālîṭ*!]). Dragons frequently encircle treasures which they guard, such as the golden fleece or the golden apples of the Hesperides. Yam, like Ocean (Ὠκεανος), is a serpentine earth-surrounder, a Uroborus.

50. This character appears with a dragon at KTU 1.6 vi 51 as an enemy of Shapsh during her (nightly) subterranean journey, there driven away by Kothar. Is Arsh comparable to the Eg. Apepi, who threatened Ra nightly, and was beaten off by Seth, or even to Ammut, the devourer of BD? Margalit (1980: 199-200: *a* + *rš*, 'Sprayer') suggests that he or she may be a whale. Cf. n. 14 to KTU 1.5 i 15. There is nothing in the text to justify supposing that Arsh is bovine in form or is another name for 'El's calf Atik' (thus Day 1985: 81; Batto 1995: 320). Day's broader argument, that Arsh is the prototype of Behemoth (see also Batto 1995: col. 320),

I finished off El's calf, Atik[51],

1.3 iii 45 I smote El's bitch[52], Fire,
I exterminated El's daughter, Flame[53].

I fought for the silver,
I took possession of the gold

1.3 iv 1 of those who drove Baal from the heights of Saphon,
knocking him like a bird from his perch[54],
(who) drove him from the throne of his kingship,
from the back-rest,
from the siege of his dominion[55].

What manner of enemy has risen against Baal,
of foe against the Charioteer of the Clouds?'

1.3 iv 5 The divine assistants replied;
they answered her:

'No enemy has risen against Baal,
nor foe against the Charioteer of the Clouds!

"Message of Valiant Baal;
Word of Valiant Warrior:

seems to go beyond the evidence, however tempting. De Moor (1971: 242) admits defeat on the problem, which is perhaps wise counsel. Pardee's (1997c: 252 and n. 93) treatment ("Arišu [Demander]") is interesting.

51. Ug. *'tk*. A mythological figure mentioned only here. Perhaps to be linked to biblical Behemoth? So Day (1985: 181) and Batto (1995: col. 320). 'Binder': Pardee (1997c: 252).

52. To Ug. *klbt il*, cf. Gk Κερβερος, the three-headed guardian of the underworld. If there is a link between the two, as suggested by Gaster (1961: 239), the gender has changed. KTU 1.19 i 10 may preserve a congener in *klb ilnm*, though I have construed it differently. See n. 183 *ad loc*.

53. Ug. *ḏbb*. Or perhaps 'Fly'? Cf. de Moor (1981–82: 114-15). Perhaps to be related to the *dbbm* of KTU 1.169.1? De Moor notes the demonic associations of flies. West (1995: 281) identifies 'Fire' and 'Flame', and further associates them with the Lamashtu demoness, who appears in some Akk. texts (e.g. RS 17.155[.27]).

54. This idiom survives as a Heb. variant in Prov. 27.8, and is preserved more closely in 1QH 4.8.

55. These lines hint at a previous deposition of Baal from his throne. The extant narrative however suggests no such thing with certainty, though cf. the wording at KTU 1.1 iv 24-25. But disharmonies and uncertainties of this kind point to a complex prehistory to the tradition.

'Bury war in the earth,
set strife in the dust,
1.3 iv 10 pour a libation into the midst of the earth,
honey from a jar into the midst of the steppe.
Grasp your spear (and) your mace,
let you feet [hast]en towards me,
let your legs hurry to me!
[For I have a word] that I would say to you,
a message [that I would repeat to you]:
[a word of] tree
1.3 iv 15 and a whisper of [stone],
[a word unkno]wn to me[n],
[and which the multitudes of the ea]rth [do not]
understand:
the si[ghing of the heavens to the ear]th,
of the deep t[o the stars].
[I understand the lightning]
which [the heavens] do not know:
[come, and I shall] re[veal it]
[in the midst of] my [div]ine mountain Saphon,
1.3 iv 20 in the sanc[tuary],
[on the mountain of] my [in]heritance.'"'
And Virgin [A]nat replied;
the Be[loved of] the Powerful One responded:
'I myself shall bury war [in the earth];
[I shall] set strife in the dust.
I shall pour [a libation] into the midst of the earth,
1.3 iv 25 honey [from a jar] into the mid[st of the st]eppe.
Let Baal set his rope[56] [in the heavens],
Let [the Charioteer of the Clou]ds kindle his [light]ning.

56. The term is usually construed as relating to harness. See R.M. Good (1984), Watson (1986; 1996a: 76) and discussion at KTU 1.4 iv 4-5, nn. 121, 122. Here a shaft of lightning is the harness of Baal's chariot. Contrast Pardee (1997c: 253 and n. 95). He translates 'watering devices', explained from √*dly*, 'draw water'. This is a good alternative.

I shall bury war in the earth;
I shall set strife [in the d]ust.

1.3 iv 30 I shall pour a libation into the midst of the earth[57],
honey from a jar into the midst of the st[eppe].

Further, another thing I shall say:

Go, go! attendants of the gods!

You may delay,
but I shall hurry

to the mountain[58] of the remotest gods,
1.3 iv 35 Inbub of the remotest chthonian gods:

two layers beneath the springs of the earth,
three expanses of the depths.'

Then
she set her face indeed towards Baal in the heights of Saphon,

a thousand miles away,
ten thousand leagues off.

The coming of his sister Baal saw,
1.3 iv 40 the approach of his[59] father's daughter.

He dismissed the women from his presence;

he set an ox before her,
a fat ram also in front of her.

She drew water and washed herself,
(with) dew of heaven,
oil of earth,
dew which hea[ven pour]ed on her,
rain with which the stars anointed her.

1.3 iv 45 She made herself beautiful with murex,
[whose] source is a thousand acres in the s[ea].

(about 15 lines missing)

'...

57. Text *awṣ*. Read *arṣ*.
58. Text *úgr*. Read *lgr*.
59. Sc. El as father of Baal. Alternatively, 'her father's daughter'.

[There is no] house for [Baal like the gods,]
[nor dwelling] like the sons of A[thirat.]
[El has a home,]
his sons [have shelters;][60]
[the Great Lady-who-tramples-Yam[61] has] a home,

60. Usually construed as 'El's house is the shelter of his sons etc.', all the deities dwelling in El's house. See, e.g., Gibson (1978: 52), de Moor (1971a: 110; 1987: 15) and cf. Pardee (1997c: 253). While this is a possible reading, and seems at first glance to be the sense of the text, it leaves some problems unresolved. It would mean that none of the other second level deities have their own homes, because they all live with their parents. De Moor rationalizes, on the ground that Baal is El's son-in-law (1987: 15 n. 75). This would suggest a matrilocal marriage-system, in which the son goes to live with the wife's parents (cf. Jacob in Aram). But I do not believe that this (and a change in practice) is the point of the narrative here. It is all intended to contrast with the climactic achievement of Baal in gaining his own palace-temple. Therefore his complaint is best interpreted as meaning that all the other deities (down to his own daughter-wives!) have homes, but he, like the son of man, has nowhere to lay his head. But the sequel will put things right! My sense is tenable if each dwelling (*mṯb, mẓll*) from [*mṯb il*] in l. 48 is recognized as cs., with gen. of the owners following. Cf. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 172-73): 'Baal has no house like the gods,| nor court like the sons of Athirat,| nor dwelling like El,| (nor) shelter like his sons,| nor dwelling like Lady Athirat of the Sea,| nor dwelling for...' (his daughter-wives being dispossessed like himself). This is also preferable to the usual sense understood.

61. Ug. *rbt aṯrt ym*. This title may be restored from KTU 1.3 v 40-41 and parallels. Notice its complete absence from KTU 1.1–1.2. Its use is restricted to KTU 1.3-6. Common translations (e.g. Gibson 1978: 52: 'Dame Athirat of the Sea') do not do justice to the verbal force of *aṯrt* in the expression. It is not the DN that is used, but a vb offering a word-play on it (rather like Exod. 3.14). The etymology of the DN is an independent question. On its intractability see Wiggins (1993: 192-93 and refs.). For my translation (based on the proposal of Albright 1968: 105), see Wyatt (1987c: 185-88; cf. 1995c: cols. 183-84, with refs. in both cases). 'She who organizes the day': Watson (1993) takes *ym* to mean 'day'. Cf. Binger (1997: 44-45), I agree with a solar assessment of Athirat (indicated in KTU 1.23, where she is geminated with Rahmay, the two forming the hypostases of Shapsh), but this need not detract from a maritime connection (seen of Shapsh, for instance, at KTU 1.6 vi 45-53). See also the discussion in Binger (1997: 44-45). The actual title used here of the goddess is the ideologically important one *Rabitu*, 'Great Lady', which serves at the interface of royal ideology and theology, and corresponds to Heb. *gᵉbîrâ*. Both terms denote the queen-mother. Cf. discussion at Pardee (1997c: 253 n. 98). His objection to the sense taken here, on grounds of vowel length, is of no consequence in so far as it is not the name Athirat here, but a verb playing on the name.

1.3 iv 50 Pidra[y daughter of Light has a home,]
Taliy daughter of Sho[wer has a shelter,]
[Arsiy] daughter of Snatcher-for-ever [has a home,]
the perfect [brides have a home]!'

And [Virgin Anat] said:

'Bull El [my father] will give me an answer,
he will give me an answer,

1.3 iv 55 or[62] [I shall give him an answer]:

1.3 v 1 [I] shall trample[63] him like a lamb to the ground;

[I shall make] his gray hair run with blood,
the gray hair of his beard [with gore],
if he does not give a house to Baal like the gods,
[and a dwelling] like the sons of Athirat!'

1.3 v 5 [She stamped her f]eet
and the earth [shook].

The[n]
[she set her f]ace
[towards El] at the source of the river[s],
[amid]st the [sprin]gs of the two [deeps].

She rolled back the tent of El,
and came to the [pavi]lion of the King, the Father of [the Bright One].

[She] came to the territory,
the tent of the creator,
[ ]

1.3 v 10 Bull [El] her father heard her voice.
E[l] r[eplie]d from within the seven c[ham]bers,

62. Text *w*, 'and'. But the sequel appears to demand that it be treated as an alternative: either she will get her way, or Anat will assault El.

63. Ug. [*a*]*mṯḫ.nn*. 'Trample'. Thus *UT* 436, §19.1527. 'Push, shove': *WUS* 192, §1639. 'Pull to the ground': de Moor (1971a: 110-11); 'drag': de Moor (1987: 15). In view of the parallels at KTU 1.3 v 23-25 and 1.18 i 11-12 (partially restored: 1.3 v 23 reads *anṯḫ*[*ṣ*], 'smite') it is worth asking whether [*a*]*mṯḫ* is an inadvertent metathesis of **amḫṣ*, 'I shall smite (him on the ground [= knock him to the ground])'. On the other hand, the text above may be a deliberate paronomasia on the other formula.

[through the e]ight façade[s of the closed] rooms[64]:

(3 lines illegible)

'...

1.3 v 15 At the feet of the divine assi[st]ants [I fall]:
I am much [afraid]!

[Will] the Luminary of the gods, Shapsh, [carry me off],
the Burning One, strength of the heavens[65].
into the han[d(s) of divine Mo]t?'[66]

Then Virgin Ana[t] replied:

64. 'Seven...eight'. Typical use of the 'n, n + 1' formula (occurring, e.g., in Amos 1.3, 6, 9 etc.) for climactic effect. The 'dominant' number here is the seven (Wyatt 1987b and references there; see also KTU 1.14 i 15-20). The pattern of a septuple universe is widespread in the ancient Near East, the seven gates of the Egyptian and Mesopotamian underworlds mirroring the seven planetary spheres of heaven above. See Wyatt (1996b: 46 n. 58). The figure locates El's dwelling at the exact centre of the universe, as Yahweh dwelt at the centre in rabbinic thought. Cf. Hayman (1986). The centre represents the absolute ontological status of the supreme deity. Pardee (1997c: 254 n. 105) interprets El's response from within as El's fear of encountering Anat's irascibility face to face. That does not save him!

65. As sun-goddess, Shapsh has a chthonian role, indicated by her nightly subterranean journey (see KTU 1.6 vi 45-53, comparable to the nightly conflict of Ra and Apepi). This suggests that she is the psychopomp, the guide of the dead into the underworld. This appears to be the meaning of the present passage. De Moor interprets this passage and parallels in a meteorological sense, as the sirocco (1971: 114-15; 1987: 16, 102). Others take a similar line in translation. Thus Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 175): 'Shapsh, the divine lamp, is burning | the skies are exhausted [√*la*] on account of divine Mot'. Cf. Driver (1956: 91), Gibson (1978: 53) and del Olmo (1981a: 190). I have taken *la* in its opposite sense ('be strong', as in Baal's epithet *aliyn*), as an abstract n. 'strength' (sc. strong one). I have taken *ṯhrrt* here as an adj. epithet of the goddess rather than as a vb. (For the verbal sense see at KTU 1.23.45, 48, 'roasted'). This approach makes better sense than to take it as an aside by the poet on the weather!

66. If this is part of the dialogue between El and Anat, it may be construed as a mocking response by El: he pretends to quake in fear, but is in truth immovable at the cosmic centre, and unlike the gods around him who aspire to kingship in heaven, he is immortal. Ironically, El describes the fate that will befall Baal (cf. KTU 1.4 viii 20-24, 1.5 i 4-8, which warn of it, and 1.6 ii 15-25, where Mot describes how it happened).

'[Let not the sons[67] of] your house, O El,
let not the daughters of your ho[u]se rejoice[68],
let not the children[69] of your [pa]lace rejoice!

I shall surely seize them in my ri[ght hand],
[I shall smite them] by the strength of my long arm[70]!

I shall [strike the top of] your skull,
I shall make your gray hair run [with blood],
the gray hair of your beard with gore!'

El replied from within the seven chambers,
through the eight façades of the closed rooms:

'I know [you], daughter, that you are piti[less][71],
and that among goddesses there is no conte[mpt] like yours!

What do you desire of me, O Virgin Anat?'

67. Restoring *bn*, cs. pl. (thus de Moor 1987: 17: *bnm* in Dijkstra and de Moor 1975: 193, which I would construe as cs. with encl.) rather than *bnt* (as *CTA*, *KTU*[1 and 2] and other commentators). 'Sons...daughters' rather than 'building' (Gibson 1978: 53), 'you have built' (Caquot and Sznycer 1974: 175), or 'within' (del Olmo 1981a: 190). Pardee (1997c: 254): 'the grandeur of your house...height of your palace'. Cf. Cassuto (1971: 100-101) for a further view. See also discussion at Pardee (1997c: 254 n. 108). For the following five cola see also KTU 1.18 i 7-12.

68. 'Rejoice' (*tšmḥ*) 3 pl. rather than 2 sg. Anat's response confirms my interpretation of El's irony. The goddess realises she is being mocked. The lesser deities ('El's children') are probably sniggering. The lowly estimation of Handy (1994: 123-29) of this genre of material as theological 'malfunctioning' is a serious misconstruction. See my response (1996b: 328-30). A malfunctioning theology is a contradiction in terms, except to its opponents.

69. Only the *b* is clearly visible. *CTA br* [*m*] (p. 19 n. 6: 'the sign following the *b* may be read as *r*, *k*, *w*, or even *n*'!). *KTU*[1] b r*m*[ ]. *KTU*[2] *b* rm[ ]. If **brm* read, cf. Akk. *baru*, Aram. *bar*, 'son, child'. Or **bnm*. The progression is thus *bn*(*m*) || *bnt* || *brm* (**bnm*).

70. The royal significance of this gesture, ubiquitous in antiquity, is well expounded by L'Orange (1953: 139-70). Cf. the cognomen of Artaxerxes I, 'Longimanus', also borne by Ardashir Bahman (L'Orange 1953: 141).

71. Ug. *kan*[*št*]. Or perhaps: 'how pitiless you are!' √*anš* II, '(be) inexorable, implacable': del Olmo (1981a: 516: cf. Heb. *'ānûš*). The line recurs in KTU 1.18 i 16. The same √ occurs of Baal at KTU 1.2 i 38, 43 ('enraged'). So also Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 175). This is preferable to 'you are like men' (Gibson 1978: 54; n. 1: 'or [ironically] 'gentle''). Similarly de Moor (1987: 17) and Pardee (1997c: 254).

And Virgin Anat replied:

1.3 v 30 'Your word, El, is wise:
you are everlastingly wise;
a life of good fortune is your word[72].

Our king is Valiant,
Baal is our ruler,
there is none (who is) above him.

We should all carry[73] his chalice,
we should all carry his cup.[74]

1.3 v 35 Groaning he cries to Bull El his father[75],
to El the king who begot him.

He cries to Athirat and her sons,
to the goddess and the band of her kinsmen:

"There is no house for Baal like the gods,
nor dwelling like the son[s of] Athirat.

El has a home,
1.3 v 40 [his s]ons have shelters,

the Great Lady-who-tramples-Yam has a [h]ome,

Pidray daughter of Light has a home,
Taliy [daughter of] Shower has [a shelter];

72. Anat's opening words are entirely in keeping with her violent nature. El's words mollify her. This expression, used by Athirat at KTU 1.4 iv 41-43 (together with the following tricolon and bicolon), appears to be an excerpt from a hymn. Cf. the following two notes. On El's wisdom see Dietrich and Loretz (1992).

73. Ug. *klnyy...nbln*. The same formula occurs at KTU 1.4 iv 45-46. Pl.: Ginsberg (1969: 133), Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 176) and de Moor (1987: 18). Du.: Gibson (1978: 54), who takes it to be Anat and Athtart here, and Anat and Athirat at 1.4 iv 45-46. If hymnic (next n.) a pl. explanation is more satisfactory. Cf. Pardee (1997c: 255 n. 112).

74. These five cola have the appearance of a hymnic excerpt. They appear to allude to a cultic context, presenting as a divine obligation the duties of priests. Their use as a reason for granting Baal a palace-temple is an interesting appeal to 'Scripture'! It is a religious duty incumbent on the gods themselves. Note the henotheistic (quasi-monotheistic) language used of Baal. This is the natural extravagance of cultic language. Baal remains 'theologically' subordinate to El himself.

75. How is this to be accommodated to the usual assumption that Baal was Dagan's son? The expression *bn dgn* used of Baal may be alternatively construed, though I have followed convention here. See n. 106 at KTU 1.2 i 19.

[Arsiy, daughter of Snatcher-for-ever has] a home,
[the perfect brides have] homes."
...'

(about 25 lines missing)

1.3 vi (about 10 lines missing)

'...
1.3 vi 1 [ ]
[ ] your head,
[ ] your brow[76],
[ ]
1.3 vi 5 a thousand [miles] by sea,
ten thousand [leagues] across the river[77].
Pass beyond Byblos[78],

76. Lit. 'between your eyes'. Cf. KTU 1.2 iv 25. De Moor (1987: 19 n. 98), following Avishur (1980: 126-27), imagines the message being worn in phylacteries on the head. Cf. Exod. 13.9; Deut. 6.8; 11.18. But in KTU 1.2 i 42 a messenger appears to carry his message (no doubt in the form of a clay tablet). Does the present instance represent a secret message, in fact remembered rather than written? The context is clear though the text is broken: the divine messenger (or pair) Qadesh-and-Amurr is being charged by Baal with instructions for Kothar. The content of the message appears merely to be to pass on his complaint. The command to build will come later from El (KTU 1.4 iv 58–v 1).

77. 'Sea...river' (*ym...nhrm*). I take it that this describes Qadesh-and-Amurr's forthcoming journey to Crete and Egypt. This is viewed from a cosmological perspective: Crete, across the Mediterranean Sea, lies beyond the ocean which surrounds the world, also imagined as an encircling river. (This supports the idea that Yam's title 'River' [*nhr*] has nothing to do with fresh water rivers.) As for Egypt, this appears in biblical mythological thought to be equated with the underworld (see discussion in Wyatt 1996b: 81-89). This would explain the peculiar wording of KTU 1.1 iii 18-20 which defines the route of a similar journey to Kothar. The king's rule 'from sea to river' in passages like Pss. 72.8, 89.26 alludes to this cosmic as distinct from geographical imagery. De Moor (1987: 19) takes *nhrm* as du. On the problem of locating Kothar's dwelling see nn. 20 at KTU 1.1 iii [0] and 36 at 1.1 iii 20-21. See also n. 83 below.

78. Ug. *gbl*. Cf. Ar. *jabal*. Thus Driver (1956: 91), Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 177 n. b) and del Olmo (1981a: 192, 531). 'Byblos' (also *gbl*; cf. Eg. *gbl*): Gibson (1978: 54), de Moor (1987: 19). There is also the nearer town of Jabal (Gibala, modern Baniyas) in the territory of Amurru. Or it could less probably be taken as

pass by the summit[79],
pass by the islands[80] to heavenly Memphis[81].

1.3 vi 10 Set off, O fisherman of Athirat,
go forth, O Qadesh-and-Amurr!

Then indeed set your face
<towards Kothar-and-Hasis,>[82]

towards Egypt, of all of which he is god,
1.3 vi 15 Crete the seat of his dwelling,
Egypt the land of his inheritance.[83]

Over a thousand miles,
ten thousand leagues.

an aerial journey passing over Mount Saphon (Jebel el Aqra).

79. Ug. *q 'l*. Thus Driver (1956: 91), Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 177 n. b) and del Olmo (1981a: 192, 619; Ar. *qā 'ilatu*, *qaw 'alatu*). Perhaps the Lebanon or (less probably) the Carmel promontory. 'Keilah': Gibson (1978: 5)! 'Qa'ilu': de Moor (1987: 19).

80. Ug. *iht*. A pl. form, √*'wy* (del Olmo [1981a: 520). Cf. Heb. *'iy*. These would be the islands of the Delta of Egypt, as the ship sailed south to Memphis.

81. Ug. *np*. Cf. Heb. *nôp*, which may be Memphis: Wyatt 1996b: 31-33). Gibson (1978: 54 n. 6) identifies it with Memphis, as does de Moor (1987: 19 n. 100). Cf. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 178 n. c). The epithetal *šmm* will be an allusion to the claim of Memphis to be a meeting-place of heaven and earth. This passage, a bicolon followed by a tricolon, describes the maritime journey (the 'sea || river', while cosmological in nomenclature, is also the Mediterranean Sea) of Qadesh-and-Amurr, who as a 'fisherman' will have travelled by ship. Dijkstra (1991: 128) suggests that the tricolon lists the stages on the voyage down to Memphis, and notes that Memphis actually had a shrine to Baal Saphon. He however identifies *np* with Carmel or 'some other projecting cape'. This 'real geography' interpretation is supported by the following lines, which confirm that Memphis (*ḥkpt*) is the messengers' goal.

82. Conjectural restoration. The context, and particularly the following tricolon, require this identification of the intended recipient of the message. Cf. Driver (1956: 91). He, however, inserts it after 'towards Egypt', which may be the logical place in Ugaritic, but is absurd in translation. Cf. KTU 1.1 iii restoration before l. 1.

83. In view of this passage, we might expect *kptr* also to refer to Egypt, but no plausible explanation has been offered. The usual explanation (Crete, cf. Heb. *Kaptôr*, Eg. *Keftiu*) is quite plausible in view of the close economic ties between Minoan Crete and Egypt, now revealed by the discoveries at Tell ed Daba. See now Morgan (1995). Political symbolism has perhaps preempted geographical realism. Kothar is of course Ptah, the artificer god of Memphis (above at KTU 1.1 iii *1). Cf. also n. 36 to KTU 1.1 iii 20-21.

At the feet of Kotha<r> bow and fall down,
pay him homage and honour him.

1.3 vi 20 And say to Kothar-and-Hasis,
declare to Hayin, who is the ambidextrous[84] craftsman:

"Message of Val[iant Baal],
wo[rd of Valiant Warrior]
'...'"'

(about 20 lines missing)[85]

1.4 i (about 20 lines missing)

1.4 i 1 [ ]
[ ]
[ ]
[ ]
'...

1.4 i 5 [Groaning he cr]ies to Bull [El his father],
[to E]l the king [who begot him];

[he cr]ies to Athi[rat and her sons],
to the goddess and [the band of] her [kinsmen],

1.4 i 10 "[there is no house for Baal like the gods],
[nor dwelling like the sons of] Athira[t].

El has a home,
his sons have shelters,

the Great Lady-who-tramples-Yam has a home,
1.4 i 15 the perfect brides have homes[86],

Pidray daughter of Light has a home,
Taliy daughter of Shower has a shelter,
Arsiy daughter of Snatcher-for-ever has a home."

1.4 i 20 There is something else I would tell you:

84. Cf. n. 23 at KTU 1.1 iii 5.

85. Perhaps the standard 'message formula' of KTU 1.1 ii 17-23 etc. is to be read here.

86. At KTU 1.3 iv 52-53, v 3 (restored) this formula follows the naming of the three goddesses Pidray, Taliy and Arsiy.

prepare, I pray, a gift for the Great Lady-who-
tramples-Yam,
a present for the Mother[87] of the gods.'

Hayin went up to the bellows:
in the hands of Hasis were the tongs.

1.4 i 25 He melted silver;
he poured out[88] gold.

He melted silver by the thousands (of shekels);
gold he poured out[89] by the ten thousands.

He cast a canopy and a bed,

1.4 i 30 a tremendous frame of twenty thousand (shekels),
a huge frame hollowed out from silver
with emeralds[90] (set) in red gold;

87. Ug. *qnyt*. Lit. 'one begetting', but 'progenitress' (Ginsberg 1969: 131) is scarcely poetical!

88. Ug. *yšlḥ*. See Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 194 n. e) on the difficulties of fixing the etymology. √*šlḥ* I, ('send') secondary sense of 'smelt': *WUS* 305, §2610. Listed as second √, 'cast, beat out (metal)': *UT* 490, §19.2420. √*lwḥ*, Š stem, 'made into plates': Gibson (1978: 150). √*lḥḥ*, Š stem, 'cause to be wet, liquify': Margalit (1980: 15). *DLU* 437, √*šlḥ* II.

89. Text *yṣqm*. Scribal error? Note that in ll. 25-6 *yṣq* || *yšlḥ*, while in ll. 26-27 *yṣq* || *yṣqm*. Is there an error in one of the word-pairs? The latter instance is the more suspicious. I have conjecturally read **yšlḥ*.

90. Ug. *šmrḫt* (*KTU*[2]) or *šmrgt* (CTA, *KTU*[1]). I explain by reference to Skt. *marakata* and Gk. *smaragdos* (also found as *maragdos*), both meaning 'emerald'. Van Selms (1975: 471 n. 18) rejected a link with Gk. *smaragdos* on the ground that the latter is derived from √*brq*. A better WS explanation would however be √*mrq* I, 'to scour, polish', appropriate for a gem, and perhaps both Gk and WS terms relate to the √ of Skt. *marakata*, *mṛj*, 'to polish'. Cf. Heb. *bāreqet*, which BDB, listing it under √*brq*, 'flash', explains with ref. to the same Skt and Gk forms (BDB, 140). It could also be cognate with the Ug. form. The same word (in the form *šmrgt*) may occur in the Zinjirli inscription KAI 215.16, though it is regarded as being of uncertain meaning (Tropper 1993a: 123-24; *DNSWI*, 1167). Wilfred Watson obligingly drew my attention to these references. Usually explained as Š pass. pt. of *mrg*, 'cover' (cf. Eth. *maraga*); thus Driver (1956: 161), Gibson (1978: 56) and del Olmo (1981a: 583), following Gaster (1950: 447). So also Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 195 n. j) with some hesitation (Tropper 1993a: 38-39). This would however be **mšmrḫ/gt*, with preformative *m*. They also cite Ar. *maraǧa*, 'cause to flow' and Ar. *maraḫa*, 'rub'. *WUS* 195, §1673: Š pt. of *mrḫ*, 'overlay, plate' (Heb. *māraḥ*, Aram. *meraḥ*, Ar. *maraḫa*). On the usual understanding, why gild silver? That is

a mighty seat with a back-rest[91] to head-height[92],
1.4 i 35 a huge footstool overlaid with polished metal;
a mighty palanquin[93] with handles,
the poles of which were of gold;
a huge table inlaid with all kinds of monsters
4 i 40 from the foundations of the earth[94];
an enormous[95] bowl in the style of Amurru
whose finish was the animals of Yaman[96],
on which were wild oxen by the ten thousand.[97]

1.4 ii (about 16 lines missing)

1.4 ii 1 [ ]
[ ]

gilding the lily! (Unless electrum is meant?) Margalit (1980: 16-17) sees a Š formation on Ar. *marǧan*, 'red coral'.

91. Ug. *nḫt*. This is a seat like El's, designed no doubt to flatter the goddess's vanity, unless the gift is supposed to be for El (see n. 95 below). It establishes the sense of the term as part of a throne. See n. 56 at KTU 1.1 iv 24 and cf. Mayer-Opificius (1983) and Metzger (1985).

92. See the statuette of the enthroned god, probably El, found in the building immediately north of the rhyton temple at Ugarit, RS 88.70 in Yon (1991: 351 fig. 2a), and the empty throne from the palace, RS 90.1, (p. 350 fig. 1b). Contrast El's low-backed throne in the small stela, RS 8.295, (p. 336 fig. 16a). See also discussion at KTU 1.1 iv 24 above and Athtar's experience at KTU 1.6 i 60-61.

93. Ug. *n'l*. 'Litter, palanquin': del Olmo (1981a: 194, 590), N of √*'ly*. 'Sandals': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 196 and n. o), Heb. *na'al*.

94. Ug. *dbbm*. Sc. mythical monsters, dragons and the like. Cf. Gen. 1.21. At KTU 1.169.1 *dbbm* is construed as 'demons'. Pardee (1997c: 256 n. 129) is probably correct in positing two distinct lexemes.

95. 'Tremendous...enormous'. The superlative *il* is used in each case. Cf. the similar usage with *adr* at KTU 1.17 vi 20-24 and n. 104. Text *id* in l. 34 to be read *il*[!]. Pardee (1997c: 256 and n. 125) takes these to be gifts made for El (hence the ref. to *il*). This seems a viable alternative at first glance, but see KTU 1.4 iii 28-29, 33-36, which evidently distinguishes these gifts for Athirat from future gifts to El. I have taken the gifts as aimed at Athirat's greed.

96. TN occurring in KTU 1.40.27. Its location is uncertain. Lit. 'South country'.

97. The double lines following may be an instruction to repeat an omitted passage, as elsewhere (KTU 1.3 iii 31; 1.4 v 41, viii 47). In view of the damaged sequel, it is impossible to be certain what the passage was.

She took her distaff [in her hand],
the spindle-whorl[98] in her right hand;
1.4 ii 5 her robe[99], the covering of her body, she removed,
her loincloth (made) from the sea,
her folded robe (made) from the river(s).[100]

She set a cooking pot on the fire,
a pot on top of the coals.[101]

98. Following Margalit (1980: 25, 28-29), who reads *q'lt* for *t'lt* of *KTU*[1] (cf. *CTA*: [*t'*/*q*]*lt*, *KTU*[2]: *t'lt*, n. 2: {*t*}*'lt* or *qlt*). For *qlt* he supposes √*ql*(*l*), and cites Ezek. 21.26 *qalqēl*. 'Spindle-whorl' makes a convincing parallel to 'distaff', particularly in view of the sexual nuance which is discernible in the sequel (thus Margalit). With the same reading, 'the spindle fell from her right hand': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 197). Similarly de Moor (1987: 47). Reading *t'lt*, 'the spindle of (her) high estate': Driver (1956: 93), followed by Gibson (1978: 56) and Pardee (1997c: 257); 'the distaff of conjuring (sc. wand?)': del Olmo (1981a: 195); 'the spindle she raised': Xella (1982: 109); 'the shawl, that had fallen in the sea': Aistleitner (1964: 38).

99. Ug. *npynh*. Some sort of a garment, the sense derived from the following *md* || *npy* (thus Margalit 1980: 29, following Driver 1956: 93, 157 n. 24). Similarly del Olmo (1981a: 195). See further Margalit (1983a) and Malul (1986). 'Its skin': Ginsberg (1969: 132). Van Selms (1971: 236-37) has identified a √*npy* 'to weave' as the basis for the term, though his application of this sense, appropriate here, at KTU 1.40.1 etc. is untenable. (I have translated this evidently quite distinct lexeme as 'atonement'.)

100. For Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 197-98) this tricolon describes Athirat washing herself clean of excrement! Gibson (1978: 56) understands it to mean that she carries her clothes into the sea (to wash them?). Similarly del Olmo (1981a: 195), de Moor (1987: 47) and Pardee (1997c: 257). Cf. also Margalit (1980: 25). Driver (1956: 93) takes *ym* to mean 'day', while Gaster (1961: 175) has Athirat chasing Yam back into the sea! I have taken an independent line, supposing the goddess's clothes to be *made* of the sea.

101. This culinary enterprise evidently taking place on the sea-shore is perhaps an allusion to the mythical tradition narrated in KTU 1.23. The goddess is seemingly interrupted while preparing for a nuptial visit from El. No wonder she is flustered when Baal and Anat turn up! Later on (at KTU 1.4 iii 14-16) Baal demands that a spindle and a whorl be removed from his cup. Are these now love-tokens which the distracted Athirat has given to him? The text allows no more than conjecture, but the curious Hittite myth in which the storm-god seduces Ashertu on Elkunirsha's instructions (Hoffner 1990: 69-70) after she has attempted to seduce him seems to bear some resemblance to the present passage. (See Margalit's remarks 1980: 42-43).

She implored[102] Bull, the perceptive god[103],
she entreated the Creator of Creatures.

In lifting up her eyes she beheld:

the coming of Baal Athirat saw indeed,
the coming of Virgin Anat,
the approach of the Beloved of [the Powerful One].

At this her feet [trembled];
her tendons [snapped about] her.

[Above, her fa]ce sweated,
[the tendons of her b]ack contracted[104],
(as did) the muscles of [her] shoulders.

She lifted up her voice and cried:

'Why has Valiant Baal come?
Why has V[ir]gin Anat come?
Are my enemies about to [sm]ite my sons?
Are they [about to destroy the co]mpany of my kinsfolk?'[105]

[The glint of] silver then [A]thirat espied,

102. Ug. *t 'pp*. While this may be intended fairly neutrally ('invoke'), since presumably El is not present, the term may have the sense of 'make eyes at', 'flutter the eyelids' (like the flapping of a bird's wings). Thus Gibson (1978: 56). Cf. de Moor (1987: 47): 'wanted to charm'. 'Plead(?)': Driver (1956: 93; cf. p. 142 and n. 9 [Ar. *'afâ*]). So also Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 198) and del Olmo (1981a: 195).

103. Note the intriguing fusion of titles: *ṯr il* (*abh*) and (*ltpn*) *il dpid*. Has a colon dropped out through haplography? Perhaps this may be tentatively read as a possible original:

t'pp ṯr il <abh	She implored Bull El <her father,
tšal ltpn il> dpid	she begged the Wise One>, the perceptive <god>,
tgzy bny bnwt	she entreated the Creator of Creatures.

104. 'Tendons...contracted': Margalit (1980: 25, 30-31) detects a word-play between *ksl* I, 'tendon' (given as 'back' by Gordon) occurring in l. 17 and *ksl* II, 'garment' (see *UT* 421-22, §§19.1280-81) occurring here: 'the hem of her (under-?) garment fluttered'. *WUS* 154, §1357 recognises only one lexeme, 'loin'. *DLU*, 226: (1) 'loin', (2) 'tendon', (3) 'side'.

105. Apparently an allusion to another theomachy tradition, unless this is an exaggerated reference to the death of Yam (and the subsequent fate of Mot). Each of these gods is beaten by both Baal and Anat. Cf. also KTU 1.6 i 39-42, v 1-4, vi 10-11.

the glint of silver and [ ]
the gleam of gold.

The Great Lady-who-tra[mples]-Yam rejoiced[106].
Aloud [she cried] to her divine assistants:

1.4 ii 30 'See the cunning work [ ][107]
O fisherman of the Great Lady-who-tramp[les-Yam];

take a net in your hands [ ]
a dragnet in both hands [ ][108]

in the Beloved of El, Y[am]
1.4 ii 35 in Yam, the god who [ ]
[Na]har, the god [ ][109]

Valiant [Baal]
Virgin [Anat]'

(about 10 fragmentary lines)

1.4 iii (about 12 lines missing)

(9 fragmentery lines)

1.4 iii 10 Valiant Baal re[plie]d;
the Charioteer of the Clouds responded:

'The Beloved came up and insulted me;
he arose and spat upon me

106. The goddess's transformation is a delight to behold! A Balzacian touch. Solid gold is a theological certainty!

107. Ug. *'n.mkṯr.ap*[ ]. Cf. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 199): 'look at the masterpiece...'. Similarly Gibson (1978: 57). Driver (1956: 93): 'Look, cunning workers...'. Del Olmo (1981: 196): 'look seriously...'. De Moor (1987: 48): 'look, successful explorer (of the bottom [of the sea])'. On another approach, Margalit (1980: 26): '(he of) the spring which nurtures dry land' (sc. epithet of Qadesh-and-Amurr).

108. Presumably the net is to catch these treasures in case they are whisked away! For de Moor (1971a: 143-45; 1987: 48 n. 214), its casting marks the beginning of the fishing-season. The sea is the cosmic ocean, and the giving to it of divine titles (specifically subordinating it to El) is a means of giving it conceptual form, and thus controlling it.

109. Normally there appears to be a clear distinction between the gods as characters and the realities they represent. Here the sea itself is personified as Yam.

in the midst of the ass[emb]ly of the sons of El.[110]

1.4 iii 15 Take the [spindle] from my table,
the whorl from the cup from which I drink,[111]

for two sacrifices Baal abhors,
three the Charioteer of the Clouds:

a sacrifice of shame
1.4 iii 20 and a sacrifice[112] of whoredom,
and a sacrifice of the debauching[113] of handmaidens.

For in it the shame is patent[114],
and in it[115] are handmaidens debauched.'[116]

110. It is impossible to determine whether this describes an event that has just taken place, or refers back to the scene in KTU 1.2 i 30-47. If the former, Yam is *redivivus*, which would explain the threat he apparently poses at KTU 1.4 vi 10-13.

111. Again, because of gaps in the text, we cannot with certainty relate this to the sequence at KTU 1.4 ii 5-9, though it was possibly Athirat who placed these tokens in Baal's cup. (This view however causes a problem in the sequence at l. 23 below, *q.v.*) There is a distinct flavour of Italian opera about the scene. For a different approach see Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 200-201). But their interpretation removes any motive for Baal's angry outburst.

112. By dittography, the word *w dbḥ* appears twice.

113. Ug. *tdmm*. Usually explained contextually in this sense; del Olmo (1981a: 537) notes parallels *dnt*, *bṯt*, and cites √*dm* V: 'act lasciviously'; cf. Ar. *ḏammama*, *'aḏamma*, Heb. *zimmâ* as cognates. Alternatively, does the term denote bloodletting (√*dm* II), and thus 'deflowering'?

114. Ug. *ltbṯ*. √*nbṯ*. Akk. *nabāṭu*, 'appear, arise'. Thus most commentators (e.g. del Olmo [1981a: 587]). Margalit (1980: 44) explains the term with reference to Ar. and MHeb. √*nbṯ*, 'sprout forth', as an allusion to birth: 'from him ([*bh*] = Baal) no shame can issue forth'. Note that Margalit takes the initial *l* to be the negative particle.

115. 'For in it...and in it...': Ug. *bh...bh...* The suff. requires that one kind of ritual (or one means of mismanaging ritual?) is at issue, and not three different kinds, as supposed by Loewenstamm (1975b: 105), in comparing Prov. 6.16. But he is surely correct in supposing that the author is quoting a well-known proverb.

116. An interesting passage for assessing the moral dimension of Ugaritic religion, often supposed (by biblical standards) to be deficient. Apart from the lack of any evidence of the cultic use of sex in the Ugaritic texts (KTU 1.23 describes a mythical marriage, rather than events performed in a temple, and is in any case the paradigm of the royal marriage) it is clear from this passage that a high moral tone was demanded, whatever dissident groups got up to in private. The fashionable account of Canaanite religion as decadent and corrupt, and sufficient justification

Following this Valiant Baal arrived;[117]
Virgin Anat arrived.

1.4 iii 25 They offered gifts to the Great Lady-who-tramples-Yam;
they gave presents to the Mother of the gods.[118]

Then the Great Lady-who-tramples-Yam responded:

'Why do you bring gifts to the Great Lady-who-
tramples-Yam,
1.4 iii 30 (and) entreat the Mother of the gods?

You should bring gifts to Bull, the perceptive god,
or should entreat the Creator of Creatures!'

But Virgin Anat replied:

'We offer gifts to the Great Lady-who-tramples-Yam,
1.4 iii 35 [we] entreat the Mother of the gods;
[later] we shall bring him gifts.'[119]

[ ] Valiant Baal;
[ ] the Great Lady-who-tramples-Yam;
[ ] Virgin Anat.

1.4 iii 40 [the gods a]te (and) drank.

[Then they were serv]ed [suckling] animals,
with jaw-shaped [knife] fillets of [fatling].

[They drank] goblets of wine,
[and from golden cups the j]uice of grapes[120].

for contemporary historical judgments, has been well judged as ideologically motivated by Whitelam (1996).

117. This suggests that Baal has made the preceding complaint while on his way to see Athirat. See following note.

118. There are a number of *non-sequiturs* in the text of the 'Baal Cycle', supporting the view that it is really a series of rather loosely related episodes. This sequence is not easily squared with the preceding sea-shore episode in which Athirat's reaction on seeing the gifts is described, since no connection is drawn in the narrative. The problem is compounded by the gaps in the text.

119. There were evidently regular procedures for gaining access to El, which involved invoking intermediaries in the first instance. This would reflect procedures at court.

120. Ug. *dm 'ṣm*. Lit. 'the blood of trees'. Either 'blood' is a metaphor for the red juice, or it is an extended use of *dm* for any life-fluid. Cf. *dam-ʿᵃnābîm* in Gen. 49.11. The vine is classified as a tree in Judg. 9.13 and elsewhere (Wyatt 1992b, p. 426).

(about 9 lines missing)

1.4 iv (about 12 lines missing)

1.4 iv 1 Bull [El]
[And the Great Lady]-who-trample[s-Yam replied]:
'[Listen, O Qadesh]-and-Amu[rr],
[O fisherman of the Great Lady]-who-tramples-Yam!
[Harness[121] an ass],
1.4 iv 5 rope up[122] a donkey;
pu[t on trappings of] silver,
of gold [the fitments].
Prepare the harness of [my] she-ass[123]!'
Qade<sh>-and-Amur[r] obeyed.
He harnessed an ass,
he roped up a donkey.
1.4 iv 10 He put on trappings of silver,
of gold the fitments.
He prepared the harness of her she-ass.
Qadesh-and-Amurr clasped (her):
he set Athirat on the back of the ass,
1.4 iv 15 on the most comfortable part of the back of the donkey.

121. Ug. *mdl* (restored from l. 9). See R.M. Good (1984: 80-81: √Ar. *dalla*, 'guide'), Watson (1986: √Akk. *madālu*, *muddulu*, 'preserve'; *muddulû*, 'elastic strip', either giving sense of leather strip). Not 'saddle', as Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 203), Gibson (1978: 59) and de Moor (1987: 52). The animal was ridden bare-back. Del Olmo's translation ('enjaeza[d]': 1981: 199) means either 'harness' or 'saddle'. Interestingly, bronze bits for the mouth have been found at Tell Ajjul (W.M.F. Petrie) and Tell Haror (E. Oren) in MBA donkey-burial contexts. See n. 17 to KTU 1.40.26.

122. Ug. *ṣmd*. Same √ as *ṣmd*, 'mace' (KTU 1.2 iv 11), the connection being the attaching with a rope. (See R.M. Good 1984: 80.)

123. The *'r*, 'ass' of l. 4 is commonly construed as a male (cf. Heb. *'ayyir*, BDB, 747), but the term used here, *atnt* (Heb. *'ātôn*, BDB, 87), is explicitly female. The third term, *phl*, occurring in l. 5, is also m. Cf. KTU 1.20 ii [4] and parallels, where I have translated *'rhm* as 'their mounts'.

Qadesh took hold of a torch[124];
Amurr was like a star in front.
Virgin Anat followed behind.[125]

And[126] Baal departed for the heights of Saphon.

1.4 iv 20 Then indeed she[127] set her face towards El
at the source of the rivers,
at the midst of the springs of the two deeps.[128]

She rolled back the tent of El
and came to the pavilion of the King, the Father of the Bright One.

1.4 iv 25 At the feet of El she bowed and fell down.
She paid him homage and honoured him.

Lo, El verily saw her.

He unfurrowed his brow and laughed.
He set his feet upon the footstool.
1.4 iv 30 He twiddled his fingers.

He opened his mouth and cried:

'Why has the Great Lady-who-tramp[les-Ya]m come?
Why has the Mother of the g[ods] arrived?

Are you very hungry? Then ea[t]!
Are you very thirsty? Then drin[k]!

124. For the awkward reading *yuḫdm.šb'r* it is preferable to read **yuḫd.mšb'r*. The latter word is √*b'r*, 'to burn'.

125. The passage evokes the scene of a cultic procession, the images of Qadesh-and-Amurr (two gods or one?) precede that of Athirat, while that of Anat brings up the rear. A further example of ritual procedure being modelled on courtly etiquette.

126. Ug. *w*. Cf. following two notes. If a contrast is to be drawn here, this should be translated 'but'.

127. 'She' is Athirat. Here and in the sequel, it is possible to translate 'they' (pl. in *t*-), especially if Baal did in spite of appearances accompany the goddesses. However, El addresses himself to Athirat alone, supporting the translation given here.

128. It appears at first glance as though all depart in different directions. In fact El also dwells on Mt Saphon (it is his throne that is delegated in turn to Yam, Baal and Athtar; see Wyatt 1996b: 34-44; 1996c): the different descriptions are for dramatic differentiation and effect. See at KTU 1.2 iii 4-5 (nn. 63, 64) and cf. KTU 1.1 iii 22-23.

Eat and drink![129]

Eat foo[d] from the table,
from goblets drink wine,
from cup(s) of gold the juice of grapes.

Is it the love[130] of El the king which stirs you,
the affection of Bull which arouses you?'

And the Great Lady-who-tramples-Yam replied:

'Your word, El, is wise;
you are everlastingly wise:
a life of good fortune is your word.

Our king is Valian[t],
Baal is our ruler:
and there is none above him!

We should all bring his cha[lice],
we should all bri[ng] his cup[131].

[Groan]ing[132] he cries to Bull El his father,
to [E]l the king who begot him.

He cries to Athirat and her sons,
to the goddess and the band of her kinsmen:

"There is no house for Baal like the gods,
nor dwelling like the sons of Athirat.

El has a home,
his sons have shelters;

the Great Lady-who-tramples-Yam has a home,
the perfect brides have a home;

Pidray daughter of Light has a home,
Taliy daughter of Shower has a shelter,

129. To this invitation cf. KTU 1.23.72-76 and Isa. 55.1.

130. Ug. *yd*. Is this 'love' or 'penis'? There certainly seems to be a sexual nuance. As we noted above at KTU 1.4 ii 5-11, the scene, though now located at the centre, not the end, of the world, is reminiscent of KTU 1.23.

131. These two tricola and bicolon have all the hallmarks of cultic language, and are perhaps cited from a hymn. Cf. the identical formulation in Anat's mouth at KTU 1.3 v 30-34.

132. The following sequence reiterates KTU 1.3 iv 47-52 (on which see n. 60) and v 35-44.

Arsiy, daughter of Snatcher-for-ever has a home."'

And the Wise One, the perceptive god, replied:

'Am I a servant,
an attendant of Athirat?

1.4 iv 60 Am I a servant, to take hold of a brick-mould,
or a handmaid of Athirat, to make bricks?

1.4 v 1 Let a house be built[133] for Baal like the gods,
and a dwelling like the sons of Athirat!'

And the Great Lady-who-tramples-Yam replied:

'You are great, O El!
The greyness of your beard does indeed make you wise;
1.4 v 5 the knowledge in[134] your breast does indeed instruct you!

And now
the season of his rains may Baal indeed appoint,
the season of his storm[135]-chariot[136].

And the sound of his voice from the clouds,
his hurling[137] to the earth of lightning-flashes[138].

133. Ug. *ybn*. Perhaps it is to be construed 'let *him* build...!' he being the putative servant of Athirat. Against this is the allusion to a handmaid, though the constraints of poetry should not be taken too literally. Perhaps it means 'let Baal build his own house!', though the form *lb'l* shows this not to be strictly the sense.

134. Ug. *dt l*. Lit. 'which (is) from'. For translation see Watson 2001.

135. Ug. *b glṯ*. The term *glṯ* means 'storm' rather than 'snow' or 'wave': Loretz (1996: 172 n. 44), following Tuell (1993) and Smith (1994: 53). Lit. 'chariot in the storm'.

136. Ug. *ṯkt*. For this interpretation, based on Hur. *šuḫitu*, *šukitu*, see Loretz (1996). His argument that it cannot mean 'ship' (Eg. *ṯkty*, thus, e.g., Gibson [1978: 60, 160]) is, however, wrong. As Gibson notes, Ra crosses the heavens daily in a ship. *ṯkt* means 'ship' in economic texts (e.g. KTU 4.81, 4.366). Aistleitner (*WUS*, §2861) distinguishes two lexemes: I, 'become solid' (Ar. *waṯuqa*, Akk. *ešēqu*, and II, 'ship', as above). Loretz has identified a third. Cf. Driver (1956: 97, 151) 'abundance of moisture', followed by del Olmo (1981a: 202, cf. p. 641): reading *ṯrt*.

137. Cf. de Moor (1987: 54) and Loretz (1996: 172).

138. These four cola constitute the only serious evidence for a seasonal dimension to the Baal cycle of texts. They hardly support the thoroughgoing expositions of the past (notably Gaster [1950, 1961] and de Moor [1971a]). For my assessment see Wyatt (1996b: 117-58). The phenomena of the storm are Baal's theophany,

A house of cedars let them build for him;
and let them[139] build him a house of bricks.

Let it be announced to Baal:

"Call a caravan into your house,
merchandise into the midst of your temple.

Let the rocks yield you much silver,
the hills desirable gold,
let the quarries?[140] bring you choicest gems.

And build a house of silver and of gold,
a house of jewels and lapis lazuli!"'

Virgin Anat rejoiced:
she stamped her feet
and the earth shook.

Then she set her face towards Baal,
in the heights of Saphon,
a thousand miles away,
ten thousand leagues off.

Virgin Anat laughed;
she lifted up her voice and cried:

'Rejoice, Baal!
Good news I bring:

A house will be given to you like your brothers,
and a dwelling like your kinsmen!

Call a caravan into your house,
merchandise into the midst of your palace.

The rocks will yield you much silver,

which is appropriate to the construction of his palace-temple.

139. 'Let them build...let them build...'. This could alternatively be construed as 'let him build...' or 'let...be built...'.

140. Ug. *udr*. 'Quarry' (italicized as a guess): *UT* 353, §19.94. While conjectural, this makes sense of the prosodic balance: 'rocks || hills || quarries'. Less convincing is Aistleitner (1964: 41; *WUS* 9, §97), 'camel' (Akk. *udru*); similarly Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 208). Cf. Jirku (1962: 46): 'caravans'. De Moor (1987: 55): 'slopes'. Del Olmo (1981a: 203): 'the most noble' (cf. Heb. *'eder*, *'addîr*); cf. *DLU*, 11; similarly Driver (1956: 97), Gibson (1978: 61) and Xella (1982: 114). This gives the sequence 'much || desirable || noblest'. Gaster (1961: 186): 'tall trees(??)'. Cf. *arz*, Heb. *'erez*, 'cedar'.

the hills desirable gold.
And build a house of silver and of gold,
1.4 v 35 a house of jewels and lapis lazuli!'

Valiant Baal rejoiced.

He called a caravan into his house,
merchandise into the midst of his palace.

The rocks yielded him much silver,
the hills desirable gold;
1.4 v 40 The quarries brought him choicest gems.

He <s>ent for Kothar-and-Hasis.

(Now return to the narrative of how the divine assistants were sent for.)[141]

Then Kothar-and-Hasis arrived.

1.4 v 45 They set an ox before him,
and a fatling before his face.[142]

A seat was prepared and he was seated
at the right hand[143] of Valiant Baal,
until [the gods] had eaten and drunk.

[Then] Val[iant Baal] said,
1.4 v 50 '[De]part, Ko[thar-and-Hasis]!

141. Editorial note. Cf. the double lines at KTU 1.3 iii 31, 1.4 i 43 and viii 47. The instruction presumably refers the reader back to a formula of messenger-sending, adapted to a message from Baal to Kothar to proceed. But it is not clear which passage is involved. The reference can hardly be to KTU 1.4 iv 2-15, for there Qadesh-and-Amurr are specifically associated with Athirat and her preparations for a journey. The other most closely antecedent passage is KTU 1.3 vi 1-25 and missing sequel, which though on a different tablet, has the advantage in terms of plausibility, since it is a message (from Baal?) to Kothar and even, despite an estimated some 40 missing lines between the two sections of text, which may have repeated the instructions, apparently continues to deal with the same matter in KTU 1.4 i 1-22. Kothar responds immediately in l. 23.

142. A feast represents the initial courtesies extended to a guest. The feasting of the gods is undoubtedly based on the realities of the sacrificial cult, which was in turn an adaptation to religious purposes of the symbolism of human commensality. The language is formulaic (Lloyd 1990).

143. The seat of honour. Cf. Ps. 110.1.

Hasten! [Build] a house indeed;
hasten! Construct a pala[ce]!

Hasten! [Let] them build a house;
Hasten! Let them construct a pala[ce],
1.4 v 55 in the midst of the uttermost parts of Saphon.

A thousand square yards let the house take up,
ten thousand acres the palace!'

And Kothar-and-Hasis replied:

'Listen, O Valiant Baal!
1.4 v 60 Understand, O Charioteer of the Clouds!

shall I not put a window in the hou[se],
a casement in the midst of the palace?'

But Valiant Baal replied:

'You shall on no account put a window in [the house],
1.4 v 65 [(nor) a case]ment in the midst of the pal[ace]!'[144]

144. The window episode is obscure, but serves to lead us up to the climax of the completion and inauguration of Baal's palace. This is undoubtedly the foundation-myth of the Baal temple at Ugarit (the northwesterly of the two on the acropolis). Reference to Jer. 9.20, where death has come in at the windows of the houses in Jerusalem, is probably not relevant to this context. Cf. Cassuto (1975: 133-35), Paul (1968: 374) and M.S. Smith (1987: 289-90; his further discussion is enlightening). The majority view has been that Kothar proposes putting windows in Baal's palace, but Baal refuses, to be told that he will in due course change his mind. Margalit (1980: 45-50) has argued persuasively that this reverses the sense intended, and I am tempted to accept his view here, though the argument is finely balanced. That Kothar would *not* want to instal windows (for whatever reason, but neither solution clarifies the motive) is certainly more remarkable than that he should. There would be little point in announcing a plan to put them in, except as a foil to Baal's response. Baal thus, on this argument, gets his way after all. The problem is twofold. Firstly, it lies in the ambiguity of the terms *bl* and *al*. Kothar's words *bl aštt* can mean either 'shall I not put?' or 'I shall not put', while Baal's words *al tšt* can mean either 'on no account (shall you) put' or 'you shall indeed put'. (See *UT* 108, 357, 372, §§12.4, 19.162, 466, 467). Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 211 n. g) propose that the windows are to allow Baal's rains to fall (the temple is thus celestial). Cf. KTU 1.2 i 14-15 (and nn. 102, 103), 1.4 vii 17-34. On the other hand, on the usual interpretation, Baal's objection is compelling, lest his consorts be stolen away and Yam rise up against him (KTU 1.4 vi 10-13: see, e.g., del Olmo [1981a: 205], and cf. de Moor [1987: 58]). The second objection to Margalit's approach, which finally clinches the argument, is in the wording of KTU 1.4 vii 19-20.

(perhaps 3 lines missing—cf. 4 vi 10-13?)

1.4 vi 1 And Ko[thar-and-Ha]sis replied
'You will return, Baal, to [my advice]'.
Ko[thar]-and-Hasis repeated his question:
'Listen, I pray, O Valiant Baal!
1.4 vi 5 shall I not put a win[dow] in the house,
a casement in the midst of the [pal]ace?'
But Valiant Baal replied:
'You shall on no account put a wi[ndo]w in the house,
(nor) a casement in the mi[dst of the pa]lace!
1.4 vi 10 Lest [Pidra]y, daughter of Light, should esc[ape][145]
[and Tali]y, daughter of Shower, [should flee[?]][146],
[or the Be]loved of El, Yam, [should arise],
[ ]insult and spit (on me).'
1.4 vi 15 And Kothar-[and-Hasis] replied:
'You will return, Baal, to my advice'.
[Quickly] his house they built;
[quickly] they constructed his palace.
They [we]nt to Lebanon and its trees,

Though the reading is uncertain (*CTA* reads *'l* h[wt], *KTU*[1] *'l* h*w*t, *KTU*[2] *'l* hwt; cf. *CTA*, I, 29 n. 8 for alternatives), it arguably supports the majority view, that it is Kothar, after all, who is in favour of the window installation. The reference to windows in Baal's palace, which presumably amounts to openings in the sky through which rain may fall and his thunder be heard, is to be compared to the openings in the sky in Gen. 7.11-12, 8.2, Isa. 24.18 and Mal. 3.10, to the temple windows (1 Kgs 6.4) and to the apparently unfulfilled condition (?) in the expression 'even if Yahweh made windows in the sky' (2 Kgs 7.2, 19; cf. LXX; MT appears unconditional).

145. Text *td* [ ]. *CTA*, *KTU*[1] read *td* [*d*], 'escape' (√*ndd*, *nwd*). Cf. Gibson (1978: 62), del Olmo (1981a: 205) and de Moor (1987: 58). *KTU*[2] leaves lacuna blank. Margalit (1980: 47) proposes *td* [*r*], 'shine' (√*dr*[*r*], 'move, flow, shine': Akk. *darāru*, Ar. *darra*). This could still yield the sense 'flow (away)'.

146. Conjectural. 'Flee': del Olmo (1981a: 205). Text [-] h/i *ṯ*/*ḫ* [ ]: thus *CTA*, *KTU*[1 and 2], followed by a gap of about six letters. Margalit (1980: 48) reads [*t*]*ḥṭ* [*l*], √*ḥṭl*, Ar. *ḥaṭala*, 'flow, pour down'. There is no recognizable word-pair here with any permutation, so that any interpretation is provisional.

to [Si]ryon and its choicest cedars;

1.4 vi 20 Yes, [Le]banon and its trees,
Siryon and its choicest cedars.

Fire was placed in the house,
fla[m]es in the palace.

Lo,
a day and a second,
1.4 vi 25 fire burned in the house,
flames in the palace.

A third and a fourth day,
[fi]re burned in the house,
flames in the palace.

A fifth and a sixth day,
1.4 vi 30 fire burned [in] the house,
flames in [the midst of the p]alace.

Look!
On the seventh da[y],
the fire was removed from the house,
the f[lam]es from the palace.

The silver had turned into ingots;
1.4 vi 35 the gold had been changed into bricks![147]

Valiant Baal rejoiced:

'My house I have built of silver,
my palace out of gold!'

The offerings of [his] house [Baal] presented;
1.4 vi 40 Hadd presented the [off]erings of his palace.[148]

147. Fire is the medium of transformation, a powerful symbol of its cultural impact. Out of the materials *crus* is constructed a palace-temple *cuit.* Cf. Lévi-Strauss's (1964) idea of the raw and the cooked. The earthly construction is thus mystically identified with its celestial archetype. Similarly, fire transforms sacrifices, and in Plutarch's *De Iside* 16, it changes a mortal into a divine person. James Mackey has drawn my attention to the sacred site of Navan Fort in Co. Armagh in Northern Ireland, used during the Iron Age in coronation ceremonies, and afterwards ritually burnt (see Harbison 1988: 155-58).

148. The term *'db*, used here in both vb and n. forms, is a technical term from the cult. Cf. KTU 1.4 viii 17; 1.6 ii 22; 1.23.54, 65, etc. For this interpretation see Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 81-82). It is preferable to the more neutral sense of

He slaughtered oxen [and] sheep:
he felled bulls
[and] the fattest of rams,
year-old calves,
skipping lambs,
kids.

He invited his brothers into his house,
1.4 vi 45 his kinsmen into the midst of his palace;
he invited the seventy sons of Athirat.

He gave wine to drink to the ram-gods;
he gave to drink to the ewe-goddesses.

He gave wine to drink to the ox-gods;
1.4 vi 50 he gave to drink to the cow-goddesses.

He gave wine to drink to the siege-gods;
he gave to drink to the throne-goddesses.

He gave wine to drink to the amphora-gods;
he gave to drink to the jar-goddesses.[149]

'db understood by e.g. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 213), Gibson (1978: 63), de Moor (1987: 60). This cultic statement is then followed by the list of offerings in ll. 40-43. As Levine and de Tarragon note, 'phenomenologically, a feast of the gods is a heavenly, sacrificial ritual'.

149. These are evidently classes of minor deities, the apotheosis of the cultural and economic realities of Ugarit. These are summed up in domestic livestock, technology (unless the significance of the amphora and jar deities is not rather their contents) and the royal throne. To the latter, cf. Isis (*jst*, 'throne') and Nephthys (*nbt.ḥt*, 'mistress of the house'), who were respectively the deified Egyptian throne and palace. Pardee (1997c: 262 and n. 178) interprets this differently. The pattern he sees continues from this initial bicolon:

> He provides the gods with rams (and) wine,
> he provides the goddesses with cows (and) [wine].

That is, all the deities are given a rich meal consisting of rams, ewes, oxen, cows, served up once they have subsequently been provided with sieges, thrones, amphoras and jars. There are three difficulties with this at first glance preferable alternative. Firstly, it requires the provision of several copulas (in ll. 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52), and for each mention of the goddesses it also requires the restoration of 'wine' (in ll. 48, 50, 52: reflected in KTU^2). This is asking a lot. Secondly, the wherewithal to sit and enjoy this fantastic meal is provided only secondarily! Thirdly it does not conform to the formulaic language (and presumably menu conventions) listed for such feasts. I take it that these minor deities are the attendants

1.4 vi 55 While they ate the gods drank.

Then they were served suckling animals,
with a jaw-shaped knife fillets of [fat]ling.

From gob[lets they drank wi]ne,
[from cu]ps of gold the jui[ce of grapes].

(5 fragmentary lines, perhaps followed by 2 missing lines)

1.4 vii 1 [ ] lapis lazuli
[ ] Valiant Baal

[ ] like the Beloved of El, Y[am],
[ ] on top of his skull.

1.4 vii 5 [ ] far...on the rock,
[ ] the gods on Saphon.

He travelled [from city to] city;
he went from tow[n to to]wn.

He seized sixty-six cities,
1.4 vii 10 seventy-seven towns.[150]

Eighty Baal [smote]
ninety Baal [captured?].

Baal [sett]led into his house,
into the midst of his palace!.

1.4 vii 15 And Valiant Baal said:

'I shall do it, Kothar, this very day,
Kothar, this very hour?!

Let a window be opened in the house,
a casement in the midst of the palace,

and mythic personnel of Baal's palace, corresponding to the human personnel in the Ugarit temple. Every item of furniture and cult is deified, or in more modern parlance, has its prototype in heaven. The strict gender matching suggests personalities comprising unities from each pair of terms (gods *and* rams etc.).

150. Baal's tour of inspection would correspond to the royal progress of a king, at once an affirmation of his territorial authority, and the opportunity to quell local rebellions. The military action of a king is the earthly counterpart of the mythical action of the *Chaoskampf*. See Wyatt (1998a). Baal's tour is the paradigm of the king's.

and let a rift [be op]ened in the clouds
1.4 vii 20 according to the word[151] of Kothar-and-Hasis!'

Kothar-and-Hasis laughed;
he opened his voice and cried:

'Did I not say to you, O Valiant Baal,
1.4 vii 25 that you would return, Baal, to my suggestion?

Let a window be opened[152] in the house,
a casement in the midst of the palace!'

Baal opened a rift in the clouds;

his holy voice Baal gave forth;
1.4 vii 30 Baal repeated the is[sue of] his lips[153].

At his h[oly] voice the earth quaked;
at the issue of his [lips] the mountains were afr[aid].

The ancient[154] [mountains] were afraid;
1.4 vii 35 the hills of the ear[th] tottered[155].

The enemies of Baal took possession of the forests,
those hating Hadd the flanks[156] of the mountain.[157]

151. Ug. *'l hwt*. Understood as above by most scholars. Margalit (1980: 61-62) reads *'lh ktr*: 'Kothar-Hasis pounded the anvil (|Kothar-Hasis did laugh)', thus avoiding the difficulty the conventional reading raises for his interpretation of the window incident.

152. Ug. *yptḥ*. G juss. pass. Thus also de Moor (1987: 63). 'He opened' (del Olmo 1981a: 209; cf. Margalit 1980: 58, who supplies a disjunctive, and Gibson 1978: 65, who supplies the subject, 'Baal'). While a 3 sg. G active is grammatically possible, it is improbable, in that the subject (*b'l*) comes only in l. 28.

153. Sc. the thunder. Cf. KTU 1.101.3-4, and the sevenfold voice of Yahweh in Ps. 29, derived from the Canaanite tradition. Discussions in J. Day (1985: 57-60) and Avishur (1995: 88-89).

154. Ug. *qdmym*. Gibson (1978: 65): 'the peoples of the east'. Virolleaud (1949: 94-95) followed by Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 217 and n. i') take this to mean 'before Yam'. Del Olmo (1981: 209): '[the shores] along the sea'.

155. While this is the conventional language of theophany descriptions, drawing on the overpowering auditory and visual experience of the cult (cf. PT 477 and Isa. 6.1-4), it shows that Baal transcends nature. He is not simply a 'nature god'.

156. Ug. *gpt*. Cf. Heb. *gap* (Prov. 9.3), Aram. *gap*, *'ᵘgap*. Thus de Moor (1971a: 266), del Olmo (1981a: 533), etc. Preferable to 'interior' (Caquot and Sznycer 1974: 217 and n. k: Ar. *ǧawf*).

157. Baal has driven his enemies beyond the frontiers of his territory. Then, uttering his challenge to them (meaning that they dare not invade) he returns to his

And Valiant Baal said:

'Enemies of Hadd,[158] you should indeed[159] fear[160],
you should indeed fear the weapons of the Mighty One[161]!'[162]

1.4 vii 40 Baal spoke[163]:

the axe[164] his (left) hand indeed brandished,

palace. Within the confines of the narrative, these foes are the forces of chaos, Yam, Mot and their allies. Ideologically, they represent all enemies of Ugarit. Gaster (1944: 32) has the bicolon addressed to Mot, 'consigning [him] to the woodlands and barren places'.

158. Text damaged. *CTA*: *hd*t, *KTU*[1]: hdt (n. 5: 't written over erasure'), *KTU*[2]: *hd* [[x]]*t*. De Moor (1971: 164, 166) reads *hd*{t}, while Margalit (1980: 63) reads *hd*m[!]. In any event the sense is plain: 'Hadd(u)' (*hd*) is the equivalent of Hadad, Adad ('thunderer'), epithet of the storm-god. See Wyatt (1992a: 412, §12).

159. Ug. *lm*. I have taken it as emphatic *l* with enclitic. Others: 'why...?'. Thus, e.g., Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 217) and del Olmo (1981a: 209). As a question, it is surely meaningless, since Baal is challenging his foes, daring them to invade his kingdom. The same translation by de Moor (1971a: 164; 1987: 63) and Margalit (1980: 63) makes sense in conformity with their different translation of the verb *ṯḫš*, on which see next note.

160. Ug. *ṯḫš*. 'Fear': √*hš*, Akk. *ḫāšu*, Ar. *ḫāša*. Thus del Olmo (1981a: 554). Cf. l. 32 above. De Moor and Margalit take it to mean 'invade' (Ar. *ḫaššа*), which I take to be less appropriate to the context (de Moor 1971a: 1, 64; de Moor 1987: 63; Margalit 1980: 63).

161. Ug. *dmrn*. Cf. Wyatt (1992a: 410-12 §11) for references and interpretations, to which should be added Cassuto (1949). The same epithet appears at KTU 1.92.30. It occurs in the Gk form Demarous as an epithet of Zeus, associated with Adodos (sc. Hadad) in Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica* 1.10. See discussion in Pardee (1997c: 263 n. 190).

162. Gaster (1944: 32), following his interpretation of ll. 35-37, makes of this bicolon a challenge addressed to Mot.

163. Lit. 'replied' (Ug. *'n*). Rather than 'viewed', as de Moor (1971a: 164; 'watched'; 1987: 64). For discussion of what I present here as a monocolon followed by a bicolon see Wyatt (1990b). Some of the alternative translations cited there are frankly incredible. Baal's words in the preceding bicolon are mirrored in his action of the following one, the two forming a kind of chiasmus about this statement of him speaking. Thus the divine word is central to the construction, as it is central to all theologies.

164. Reading either *q<r>dm*, or *qdm* (thus tablet) with sense of 'axe'. For the former suggestion see Wyatt (1990b); for the latter see Wyatt (1996a: 354-55), Durand (1984) and Mayer (1989: 268). (Thanks to Wilfred Watson for these references.)

the cedar (was) in his right hand.[165]

Then Baal returned to his house.

'Will either king or commoner[166]
establish for himself dominion in the earth?[167]

1.4 vii 45 I shall surely send a messenger[168] to divine Mot,
an envoy to the Beloved of El, the hero.

Mot may mutter to himself,
the Beloved may scheme in his heart[169];

1.4 vii 50 (but) I alone[170] it is who will rule over the gods,
who will fill gods and men,
who will satisfy the multitudes of earth!'

Aloud to his divine assistants Baal cries:
'Look, [Gupan] and Ugar,

1.4 vii 55 The Dark One[171] [has obscured[172]] the day,

165. For my interpretation of this bicolon see Wyatt (1990b). This visual representation of Baal corresponds closely to the 'Baal au foudre' stela, RS 4.427 (Yon 1991: 331, §11a), on which the god flourishes a fenestrated axe in his right hand, while holding a spear that becomes a tree in his left. Cf. also the inscription concerning Baal from Medinat Habu cited in *ANET*, 249: 'Baal smites thee with the cedar tree which is in his hand'.

166. Cf. Pardee (1997c: 263): 'Is there or is there not a king...?'.

167. This bicolon appears to be a further challenge addressed to any who would contest Baal's kingship. The question invites the inevitable response 'of course not!', which supports my approach to the preceding. What precedes has been addressed to foes on earth. What follows is addressed to Mot, lord of the underworld. In view of this firm rebuttal of any claim by Mot, Baal's subsequent capitulation is strange. Gaster (1944: 32) understands this to be an allusion to Mot.

168. Ug. *dll*. Ar. *dalîlu*, 'guide' (Albright [1933: 18 n. 48], followed by de Moor [1971a: 168] and del Olmo [1981a: 536]). Cf. Jirku (1962: 52): 'herald(?)'. Cf. also Akk. *dayyālu*, 'messenger'. Gaster (1944: 32, 45): 'cheapskate' (Ar. *dallu*, BHeb. *zôlēl*), construed with preceding words: 'shall ever a cheapskate instal himself o'er the land of my dominion?'. The views of Gaster noted above were all later abandoned (Gaster 1961: 197-99).

169. 'To himself...heart'. Lit. 'in his chest...in his gullet' (*npšh...gngnh*).

170. In grammatical terms this tricolon could be the content of Mot's scheming, which Baal quotes. Thus Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 218-19) and Pardee (1997c: 263). In this case it would be full of ironies, since only Mot would be full! I have taken it rather as Baal's rejection of Mot's pretensions.

171. Text *bǵlmt*. *CTA b<n.>ǵlmt*, followed by *KTU*[1 and 2], following reading of KTU 1.8.7. Margalit (1980: 68) thus translates as 's<ons> of the maiden [with the

the Gloomy One the ex[alted Soverei]gn[173]'.

(5 unintelligible lines, followed by about 7 missing lines)[174]

1.4 viii 1 'So set your faces towards Mount *Trġzz*,
towards Mount Shirmegi[175],
towards the twin (peaks) of the Ruler of the underworld.

1.4 viii 5 Raise the mountain on your hands,
the hill on top of your hands,

turban]' (the latter expression a rendering of *ʿmm*). Cf. de Moor (1971a: 164): 'the sons of Concealment...', evidently denoting Gupan and Ugar. See also Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 219 and n. w). I have followed this latter sense. Note that *b<n> ġlmt* is paralleled by *bn ẓlmt* in l. 55, from which it takes its sense. I have taken the parallel expressions to be epithets of Mot. Lit. 'son of darkness...son of gloom'. Note the word-play, in which each title contains the element *mt*.

172. Ug. *ʿmm* restored after KTU 1.8.8. The verb does double-duty, with 'the exalted Sovereign' (sc. Shapsh) the object in the second colon.

173. Ug. *rmt prʾt*. The damaged text here may be confidently restored from KTU 1.8.9. Translation, though not interpretation, follows de Moor (1971a: 164, 172). Cf. Gibson (1978: 66). To *rmt* cf. the second element in Gk Andromeda, which I interpret as **Anatu ramitu*: cf. Wyatt (1988a: 376 n. 11). To *prʾt* (Gibson, 'princess' [so also de Moor (1987: 65)]), cf. Heb. *perāʿ*, 'prince'; Ar. *farʿu*, 'chief'. Perhaps the source of this is Eg. *pr ʿȝ*, 'great house' (sc. royal palace) and by extension 'king (pharaoh)', Heb. *parʿô*. De Moor takes this to be a description of a sirocco, obscuring the sunlight. I take it to be the appearance of Mot, perhaps in the form of a solar eclipse, which is an awful omen for Baal. It would be on account of this that he sends his messengers to Mot, perhaps hoping to appease him. Unfortunately, the reason for the embassy must have been in the lacuna following. For what some have taken to be an account of a solar eclipse, see KTU 1.78.

174. The missing section of KTU 1.4 vii 56-60 can be partially restored from KTU 1.8.9-17, but to no useful purpose. For attempted translations see de Moor (1971a: 164; 1987: 65-66), Gibson (1978: 66), and Margalit (1980: 68).

175. Ug. *trġzz...ṯrmg*. See Tsevat (1974b) for the suggestion that the two terms are Hur., the *r* being interpolated to suit Ug. phonetic rules. To the latter (Hur. Shimegi + *r*) cf. the name Thamaq occurring at KTU 1.22 i 8. Tsevat interprets these as the mountains of the horizon, between which the sun rises and (or) sets. I understand it to be the western flank of Saphon (Jebel el Aqra) which drops abruptly into the sea. Cf. Margalit (1980: 75). Gaster (1961: 197) sees the mountains as northern, and identifies the names with the 'Asiatic deities Tarhu and Sharruma'. The former (Tarḫu) is the Hittite storm-god, the latter the son of the Hurrian storm-god Teshub and his consort Ḫebat (van der Toorn 1995: col. 745).

and go down into the house of the couch[176] of the earth,
be numbered among those who go down into the earth.

1.4 viii 10 Then set your faces indeed
towards his city Muddy,

a pit the seat of his enthronement,
a crevice the land of his inheritance.

1.4 viii 15 But take care, attendants of the god,
do not draw near divine Mot,

lest he offer you up[177] like a lamb in his mouth,
1.4 viii 20 like a kid in the opening of his maw!

Lest you be carried away by the Luminary of the gods,
Shapsh,
the Burning One, strength of the heavens[178],
into the hand(s) of the Beloved of El[179], Mot.

1.4 viii 25 Over a thousand miles,
ten thousand leagues,

at the feet of Mot bow and fall down,
pay him homage and honour him.

1.4 viii 30 And say to divine Mot,
declare to the Beloved of El, the hero:

"Message of Valiant Baal,
1.4 viii 35 [wor]d of Valiant War[rior]:

My house I have built [of silver],
[I have constructed my palace out of gold]
..."[180]

176. For this designation of the tomb, cf. Heb. *bêt ḥopšît*, and see Tromp (1969: 157-59). Note the irony here: Baal's messengers are to experience in their journey to Mot the threat voiced by Mot with regard to Baal himself in KTU 1.5 i 5-8, 31[-35], v 11-17 and fulfilled in KTU 1.5 v 17-25 and the missing sequel. Pardee (1997c: 263): 'the place of seclusion'.

177. Ug. *'dbkm*. The cultic use of the vb is to be understood here, as at KTU 1.4 vi 39 (n. 148).

178. Ug. *ṣḥrrt la šmm*. For explanation see n. 65 at KTU 1.3 v 17-18.

179. Text: *mdd.ilm.mt*. || at KTU 1.6 ii 24-25 reads *bn.ilm.mt*. || at KTU 1.3 v 18 restored thus. Variation of this kind is to be expected against a background of oral tradition.

180. We can only guess at the precise content of the missing message Baal sent

(9 unintelligible lines)

(about 17 lines missing)

1.4 viii edge: [the scribe is Ilimilku the sac]rificer of Niqmad king of Ugarit[181].

to Mot. It probably has something to do with his belligerent language at KTU 1.4 vii 45-52. Mot's response at KTU 1.5 i 1-8 (given to Gupan and Ugar) and ll. 12-31 [32-35] (delivered to Baal) is equally belligerent. There is something of the wicked fairy motif here: Mot was not invited to the feast. He will therefore make a feast of Baal!

181. See nn. 127-34 at KTU 1.6 vi 54-58, and discussion in the notes of KTU 1.113 and 1.161.

KTU 1.5–1.6: Baal and Mot

1.5 i '...

1.5 i 1 Though you smote[1] Litan[2] the wriggling[3] serpent,
finished off the writhing serpent,[4]
Encircler[5]-with-seven-heads[6],
the skies will be hot, they will shine[7]

1. This is generally accepted as concessive *k* with 2 sg. vb (and those following). Margalit (1980: 88-90) takes the verbs as imper.

2. Ug. *ltn*. Emerton (1982) proposed the vocalisation *Lītān*; cf. Udd (1983). Cf. Heb. *liwyātān*, 'Leviathan' and Gk Ladon, the serpent guarding the golden apples of the Hesperides (Graves 1960, II, 145-52 §133: various classical sources).

3. Ug. *brḥ* cf. Heb. *bāriaḥ*. 'Wriggling': so also Driver (1956: 103); cf. Day (1985: 142): 'twisting'. Alternatives include 'evasive': Gaster (1961: 201); cf. 'fleeting': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 239); 'slippery': Gibson (1978: 68); 'fleet': Margalit (1980: 88); 'fleeing': del Olmo (1981a: 529; *DLU*), Heb. *bāraḥ*. 'Sinister': Gaster (1944: 47); 'evil': Gordon (1953: 243-44), Ar. *barḥ*. 'Primeval': Albright (1941: 39 n. 5). The sense should be determined by || *'qltn*.

4. The first two lines of this tricolon are, allowing for translation, remarkably close to the Heb. text of Isa. 27.1, demonstrating the close affinity between the forms of Ug. and Heb. poetry:

Ugaritic	Hebrew
	b'yôm hahû' yipqōd yhwh...
k tmḥṣ.ltn.bṯn.brḥ	*...'al liwyātān nāḥāš bāriaḥ*
tkly.bṯn.'qltn	*we'al liwyātān nāḥāš 'aqallātôn.*

5. Ug. *šlyṭ*. see KTU 1.3 iii 42 (n. 49). On the concept see Neiman (1977). This serpentine epithet is preferable to 'ruler', 'tyrant' (e.g. Driver 1956, 103; Gibson 1978: 68; del Olmo 1981a: 213; Day 1985: 142) or the like, based on Akk. *šalāṭu*, Heb. *šālaṭ*, 'rule'. Pardee (1997c: 265): 'the close-coiling one'.

6. Cf. Lewis (1996c) for the iconographic tradition of the seven-headed dragon. The biblical allusions to the motif are unspecific in Ps. 74.13-14 ('heads of the dragon [read *tannînîm* as old gen. sg.]...heads of Leviathan'), but explicit in Rev. 12.3 etc., and a Christian iconography developed from this.

7. Ug. *ṯṯkḥ.ttrp.šmm*. This colon is susceptible of various interpretations. The first vb (√*ṯṯkḥ*), which has continued to cause difficulties (cf. Rabe 1995: 433-36 and n. 23), appears to be used of sexual arousal at KTU 1.11.1. The underlying sense appears to be 'heat'. The second is construed by Gibson (1978: 68, 158) as Dt form of √*rpy*, 'droop' (cf. Heb. *rāpâ*): 'the heavens will burn up (and) droop (helpless)'. Margalit (1980: 88, 91-92), construing entirely differently, and dividing the cola differently, understands the first as 'wither' (citing Ps. 102.5, where √*škḥ* || √*ybš*), and the second as 'convulse' (citing √*rpp*, MHeb. *raprēp*, Ar. *raffa*, *rafrafa*). My

1.5 i 5 when I tear you in pieces:
I shall devour (you)[8],
elbows[9], blood and forearms;[10]

You will indeed go down into the throat of divine Mot,
into the maw of the Beloved of El, the hero.'

The gods departed and did not stay.

1.5 i 10 Thereupon they set their faces
towards the lord of the heights of Saphon,

and Gupan and Ugar said:

'Message of divine Mot,
word of the Beloved of El, the hero:

1.5 i 15 "My appetite is the appetite of the lion in the waste-
land[11],

translation is indebted to Emerton (1972: 62-66, 69). He cites Ar. *raffa*, 'shine, glisten', and explains *ṯṯkḥ* contextually (cf. 'heat' above). Van Selms (1975b: 481) concurs on *ṯṯkḥ*, though translating as 2 sg. D, 'you set alight, made burn'. Cf. Emerton's response (1978: 74).

8. Wilfred Watson (privately) expresses a doubt as to whether the first two cola here are separate. Cf. his stichometry (1995: 222).

9. Ug. *uṯm*. For this sense, or 'hands', see *DLU*, 59-60. 'Thigh': Emerton (1978: 77, following van Selms 1975b: 482). These senses are not recognized by Renfroe (1992: 84-85). Watson (1995a: 222-23) makes some tentative remarks on the colon.

10. For justification of the translation of this tricolon see the discussion between Emerton (1972 and 1978) and van Selms (1975b). The idiom is a corporeal equivalent to 'lock, stock and barrel'. For similar treatments see Gibson (1978: 68) and de Moor (1979: 642). For entirely different approaches see, for example Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 239-41), Margalit (1980: 88-96) and del Olmo (1981a: 213; 1984: 158-59). The material remains intractable. The expression recurs at KTU 1.18 iv 3.

11. Ug. *lbim thw*. Translated as above on this reading, and the prosody understood accordingly. It is possible, however, that we should reconstruct the colon as follows, *lbim thw hm* >**lbim th*(*w*)*m*, to yield:

pnp̄š.npš.lbim thm.	My appetite is the appetite of the monster of the deep,
brlt.anḫr.bym	the desire of the shark in the sea...

This would give a maritime bicolon, followed by a wilderness bicolon ('wild bulls... hind...') in ll. 16-17. Such an arrangement is arguably a better prosody in terms of the internal construction of each bicolon than that given above. The term *lbu*, while normally construed as 'lion', appears as a designation of Tiamat in monstrous form in CT 13.33-34 obv. 17, 24, rev. 4, 7, 9 (Lewis 1996c: 32-34; translated

as[12] the desire[13] of the shark[14] is in the sea;
as wild bulls yearn for pools,

'dragon' and explained by ref. to Wiggerman 1989: 118). Spronk (1995: col. 1292) wonders whether this Akk. term and Heb. *rāhāb* (a designation of the raging sea) are not perhaps cognate. We may ask whether a link may not also exist between *labbû* and *ltn/lwṯn*. Watson (1994d: 280) has also drawn attention to Ahiqar §34 (viii 117: ET of Charlesworth 1985: II, 502 [and see n. i]):

> There is no lion in the sea;
> therefore the sea-snake is called *labbu*.

For further comments see also Lindberger (1983: 105-107). Cf. also Ahiqar §28 (vii 110). While *thw* means 'wilderness' (Heb. *tōhû*), *thm* (Heb. *t^{e}hôm* [*thwm*]) means 'deep', as in 'cosmic ocean' (KTU 1.23.30 and 1.100.1). Its written form *thwm* is not otherwise attested in Ugaritic, and the error may be scribal. Either the 'o' vowel has been written inadvertently, or, a better explanation, the *w.h* sequence is an erroneous insertion, anticipating the *hm* of the following colon. This conjecture cannot however be squared with the reading of KTU 1.133.2-5—which is why it is relegated to a footnote—though the latter is not necessarily to be preferred, especially since it is a scribal exercise (*KTU*^{2} 140). See Pardee (1988a: 158-61) for comments on the two passages. Another possible parallel is 1QH 5.9-10, where *k^{e}pîrîm* appears in parallel with *tannînîm*. Because it is usually translated 'young lions... vipers' or similarly the possible maritime origin of the image has been missed. While *k^{e}pîrîm* occurs here, *l^{e}bî'îm* occurs in ll. 7, 13 (ref. to the lions' den), and *'ariyôt* in l. 19. A wide range of chthonian images appear in this hymn, and it seems to me that ll. 9-10 may have been intended as an allusion to the sea-monster (a putative **labbû* ‖ *tannîn*, both terms subsequently pluralized).

12. Ug. *hm*. Lit. 'if'. But the real point here, if we retain the text (see previous n.) is a comparison, 'as... so...'. Mot claims that he is merely conforming to his nature ('death by name, death by nature'). Margalit (1980: 97): 'my 'soul' is the 'soul' of a wild lion [sc. lion of the wilderness]'. Does this mean that other predators are merely avatars of Mot?

13. 'Appetite... desire...'. The terms *npš*, *brlt* here both denote something like the 'élan vital'.

14. Ug. *anḫr*. On the basis of Akk. *nāḫiru*, this is usually understood to mean 'whale' or 'dolphin' (Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín 1975g: 538; del Olmo 1981a: 515). De Moor (1979: 64): 'sperm whale'. Whales up to lengths of some fifty feet (fifteen metres) appear occasionally in the Mediterranean Sea. See n. 50 at KTU 1.3 iii 43. I have translated 'shark' because of the resonances of this word for an English speaker. I have taken the sequence to mean not simply the affinity of various creatures for a specific environment—though that is also present, and particularly so in the following bicolon—but rather as placing an emphasis on the appetite itself. The point of the present bicolon is a pair of metaphors to illustrate Mot's gargantuan capacity for food. The following bicolon extends the element of longing, of intrinsic need.

or the hind longs[15] for the spring.
Look, in truth[16] does my throat devour clay[17],
1.5 i 20 and[18] with both my hands I devour them[19].[20]

15. Text *kḏd*. I have corrected *ḏ* to *š* (the central stroke has been omitted) and read **<t>kšd* as in previous colon, 'desire' (vb). (Or the two forms are to be differentiated more for prosodic than for semantic purposes.) For the idiom cf. Ps. 42.2. Cf. Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín (1975g: 538) and Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 242), where however the verbal and substantival senses respectively of the words destroy the prosodic balance. Gibson (1978: 68, 145): 'herds', Ar. *ḏawdu*. Cf. Renfroe (1992: 100-102). Cf. also del Olmo (1981a: 214 [but cf. p. 564 √*kḏd*]) and de Moor (1987: 70). Margalit (1980: 97): 'like the teat' (*ḏd* = *ṯd*). The approach of Dietrich and Loretz (1978a: 435) is different again.

16. Understanding the repeated *imt* here to be a dittography. On the term see Tropper (1992).

17. Sc. flesh. The contrast is surely between the life-breath and the body, made of clay, both of which Mot destroys. Cf. the dual nature of Adam in Gen. 2.7, where the divine *nᵉšāmâ* is breathed into the body made of 'dust' (*ʿāpār*, cf. the present 'clay', *ḥmr*), thus becoming a 'living being' (*nepeš*). The Ug. text represents an earlier stage of this anthropology, the *npš* serving as the 'breath' element, though the present text in no way hints that it is divine in origin. When a person dies in Hebrew thought, the *nᵉšāmâ* returns to its divine source (Job 34.14). Mot here appears to devour everything. Cf. Husser (1995), who argues that the point of the funeral rites performed by the dutiful son is to keep the 'breath' (*qṭr*) *in* the tomb, not to release it. See at KTU 1.17 i 27 and n. 30. The present passage is not a key to understanding Ugaritic psychology, but rather a maximalist view of death, put into the mouth of Mot himself. The two need not coincide. There is no need to think of 'clay' as a euphemism (thus de Moor 1979: 640).

18. Dietrich and Loretz (1991a: 92) also take the repeated *imt* here to be dittographic.

19. Ug. *hm*. This is taken here to be the suffix of the preceding vb. With so many instances of *hm* (five in eight lines), it is scarcely surprising that one or two errors have occurred. Others, 'if'. Errors of this type (putting in an erroneous word-divider), and such as *thw.hm* for *thm* above at l. 15 (discussion in n. 11) suggest that the errors have arisen in copying, not in dictation.

20. The syntax of this bicolon is not entirely satisfactory. Is it possible that *imt* is verbal? This could yield the following sense (retaining all three instances, two treated above as dittography), which I offer tentatively:

them do I kill,
I kill the life-force,
I consume the clay,
and I kill with both hands!

My seven portions are on the plate,
and Nahar[21] has mixed my cup.

For Baal did not[22] invite me with my brothers,
(nor) did Hadd summon me with my kinsmen,

but he ate food with my brothers,
1.5 i 25 and drank wine with my kinsmen[23]![24]

But you forget, Baal[25], that I can indeed pierce you,
[.]

Ug. *hm* in the first colon is generally construed as the particle 'if'. I am taking it here to be the 3 pl. obj. pron. (error for *hmt*? cf. *UT*, 149: thus *hm<t>*). Cf. the treatment of final *hm* in the translation above, which I take to be the 3 pl. obj. suff., taking the word-divider to be an error. Note the chiastic arrangement of this and the following colon. I have here taken *imt* to be the D form of *m(w)t*, 'to kill' (cf. Heb. polel). Note initial *i* vowel (*amt* is G form). Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 242) and others take *imt* to mean 'truth' (Heb. *'emet*), and see its repetition as emphatic. This is however prosodically quite unconvincing, and certainly unparalleled. Margalit (1980: 101-102) takes the first and third instances of *imt* to be 'verdure' (Ar. *'amat*), thus half-turning Mot into a vegetarian, who lives on a diet of plants and clay! The point is however that he devours all living things (all flesh). I doubt that Ilimilku had vegetables in mind.

21. Ug. *nhr*. 'Cup-bearer': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 242). I take it that Yam-Nahar *redivivus* is Mot's cup-bearer.

22. Ug. *kl*, construed as *k* + *l* neg. part. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 243), Margalit (1980: 104) and del Olmo (1981a: 215) construe the *l* as asseverative, with Mot daring Baal to invite him. This surely misses the point, however, as Mot was *not* invited to the consecration of Baal's temple-palace. He is hardly to be placated by a late invitation!

23. Textual difficulty. *CTA*: *a*[*ḫ*]<*y*>*yn*; *KTU*[1]: a*[*ḫ*]y* yn; *KTU*[2]: a*ḫy.yn*. I have supposed this to be a scribal error for *aryy yn*, *ary* being the standard *b* word to *aḫ* as *a* word (as in l. 23 immediately above). Cf. *UT*, 178: *a*[*r*]*y*<*y*>*n*, a reading rejected by *CTA* (p. 33 n. 9). But the reading is to be supported on the basis of scribal error.

24. Baal's omission of Mot from an invitation which did include his brothers is rightly construed by him as a deliberate insult. The consequence, which will be disastrous for Baal, is that Mot, excluded from the feast, is not bound by ties of commensality to Baal. This is the classic 'wicked fairy' or 'exclusion from the feast' motif.

25. The abrupt change from describing Baal's failure to invite him in the 3 p. to a challenge to Baal himself in the body of the message is a masterly treatment of Mot's discourse. He has rambled off into a reminiscence of why he is peeved, almost an aside, then reverts suddenly to its consequence: he now throws down the gauntlet to Baal.

Though you smote [Litan the wr]iggling [serpent],
finished off [the writhing serpent],
1.5 i 30 Encircler-[with-seven-heads],
[the heavens] will be hot, [they will shine]
[when I tear you in pieces],
[I shall devour (you),]
[thighs, blood and forearms;]
[you will indeed go down into the throat of divine Mot,]
1.5 i 35 [into the maw of the Beloved of El, the hero.][26]
..."'

(about 30 lines missing)

1.5 ii (12 lines missing)

1.5 ii 1 [ ]
[He extends[27] a lip to the ea]rth,
a lip to the heavens,
[he extends] a tongue to the stars.[28]
[Ba]al must enter[29] his belly,
1.5 ii 5 down into his mouth he must go,[30]
since he[31] scorched the olive,
the produce of the earth,
and the fruit of the trees.[32]

26. Ll. 31-35 conjectural, based on ll. 4-8. Cf. *CTA*.

27. Margalit (1980: 107) restores [*št*]*m* preceding, parallel with [*šlḥ*] in the following colon. Cf. *št* in KTU 1.23.61, which however does double duty. *KTU*^{2} reads [xxxxxx]xx*ḫ*m (Rom.) in l. 1.

28. This tricolon echoes the description of the voracious appetites of Shahar and Shalem in KTU 1.23.61-62, on which basis it is restored, the tongue being an additional feature peculiar to the present passage.

29. Some such modal sense is required, because Baal's descent does not occur until some point during the lacuna of KTU 1.5 v–vi.

30. Note the chiastic structure of the bicolon, framed by the assonantal verbs of movement *y'rb* || *yrd*.

31. Sc. Mot.

32. De Moor (1971: 180) gives a seasonal explanation of this tricolon. More pertinent is the language of cosmic dessication which occurs at an untimely death such as Aqhat's (KTU 1.19 i 30-31, 42-46), which anticipates David's curse in

Valiant Baal was afraid of him;
Valiant Warrior was in dread of him.

'Depart[33], say to divine Mot,
declare to the Beloved of El, the hero:

1.5 ii 10 "Message of Valiant Baal,
word of Valiant Warrior:

Greetings, O divine Mot,
your servant am I, and forever so[34]"'.

The gods departed and did not stay.

Then
they set their faces
towards divine Mot,
1.5 ii 15 towards his city Muddy,

a pit the seat of [his] enthronement,
a crevice the land of his inheritance.

They lifted up their voices and cried:

'Message of Valiant Baal,
word of Valiant Warrior:

"Greetings, O divine Mot,
1.5 ii 20 your servant am I, and forever so"'.

Divine Mot rejoiced,
[he lifted up] his voice and cried:

'Why, has [Baal] invited me [with my brothers],
has Hadd summoned me [with my kinsmen]?
...'

2 Sam. 1.21. Nature is in mourning here. The present passage appears to involve Mot's malevolence.

33. This is the content of a message instruction given to Gupan and Ugar. They must have been summoned again in the missing section between the end of KTU 1.5 i and ii.

34. This message is ambiguous. It could be no more than a polite vacuity, though the description of Baal's feelings in ll. 6-7 suggests rather more. Whatever the nuance, Mot will accept it as a capitulation. But we must not conclude simply that Baal is preparing to die, despite the wording of ll. 3-5, for Mot's immediate response is to expect a fresh invitation! It is too easily forgotten that two entire columns (about 115 lines) are in effect missing before the narrative resumes at KTU 1.5 iv 5.

(5 unintelligible lines, followed by about 23 missing lines)

1.5 iii (10 lines missing at beginning and about 20 at the end; the extant text covers only half the width of the column over 30 lines, and is unintelligible)[35]

1.5 iv (in much the same condition as col. iii, of which it is the reverse: about 22 missing lines)

(4 unintelligible lines)

1.5 iv 5 He lifted up his voice [and cried]:

'Now where is Baa[l]
where is Hadd[36], who [ ]?'

Baal appeared [with his seven divine assistants],
with his eight [boars[37]]

35. For an attempt at col. iii see Driver (1956: 104-105), Gibson (1978: 70-71) and de Moor (1987: 74-75).

36. Text *i...b' [l]...i hd...* Does the formula perhaps arise from the cult, perhaps in the context of a hymn of lament over Baal's death? We have noted apparent snatches of cultic hymnody already. To the double formula used here, cf. the putative *i zbl*, which would become in Heb. *'ay ẓ^ebul*, 'where is the prince (sc. Baal)?', lampooned as *'îzebel*, (pause *'îzābel*, 'Jezebel'), 'where is the dung?' (or some such scatological sentiment: perhaps Akk., Ar. *ziblu*). Cf. Virolleaud (1935c: 185 n. 1), and see Montgomery and Gehman (1951: 291) and Gray (1964: 332-33). Mussies (1995: col. 889) does not recognize this interpretation of the PN.

37. On Baal's assistants as boars see Wyatt (1987b: for which see also on the 'seven...eight' numerical sequence, with refs.). My suggestion that they may be related to the Maruts, assistants of Indra, is not invalidated by my change of mind on the question of the overall origin of the *Chaoskampf* myth (Wyatt [1988a], modified in the light of new early discoveries of a Near Eastern tradition [1998a]). The fact remains that Indra *is* known in the Near East, in a Hurro-Hittite treaty text (*ANET*, 206). However, 'boar' (*ḫnzr*) may be an animal term for military rank (cf. Heb. *'ālûp*, *ṣ^ebî*): 'officers', Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 247). Cf. at KTU 1.15 iv 6-7 and n. 169. Pigs also featured in the Gk Thesmophoria rites which involved chthonian goddesses, of whom Baal's consorts appear to have been Semitic analogues, if not prototypes. Cf. Astour (1969: 14), who cites Harrison (1922 [= 1955]: 124-26). See also nn. 11-13 at KTU 1.3 i 23-25. Apropos of this, note the association of boars and goddesses in the descent instruction below, KTU 1.5 v 9-11. A more prosaic account may be given of *ḫnzr*. *CAD*, VI Ḫ, 166 cites Akk. *ḫaziru*, var.

1.5 iv 10 He drew near [ ]
to eat [ ]
While [the gods] ate [and drank].

the [gods] were served with suck[ling animals],
with [a jaw-shaped] knife [fillets of fatling].

1.5 iv 15 They drank gob[lets of wine],
from cups of gol[d the juice of grapes].

Cups of silver [ ]
goblets [of gold]

(7 more unintelligible lines, followed by about 11 missing lines)

1.5 v (about 25 lines missing)

1.5 v 1 '[ ]
Valiant [Baal]
[ ]your torch[38]
[ ] your right hand
your [so]n [will have?] the appetite[39] of a bull-calf.
1.5 v 5 I shall place him in a hole of the earth-gods[40].

As for you[41],
take your clouds,

ḫanziru, āziru, 'helper', perhaps linked to WS √'*zr*, appearing in such PNs as *Iliḫaziri*, ^{d}UTU-*ḫazir*. Cf. *AHw*, 166-67.

38. Text [ ] *ipd prk*: *KTU*^{2}. *CTA*, *KTU*^{1} read *ip.dprk*, i*p.dprk respectively. Del Olmo (1981a: 220, 522): text as *CTA*, but translated as 'tunic (*ipd*) of your bull (*pr* + *k*)'. Gaster (1961: 210), 'thy torches'. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 247 [as *CTA*]: '...your torch [Akk. *dipāru*]'). So also Gibson (1978: 72). De Moor (1987: 77): 'the cloak of your sovereignty'. But with a broken context, no clear contextual sense can be recovered.

39. Ug. *npš*. De Moor (1971: 183; 1987: 77): 'soul'. Cf. del Olmo (1981a: 220). Alternatively, may this be construed as the lung of a calf (*npš 'gl*) which will be offered as a sacrifice of redemption for a first-born son? (Cf. Exod. 13.11-15.) But such an interpretation would not be compatible with the threat of Mot's next words. Gibson's interpretation (1978: 72), 'the life of a calf', may point to the son himself being sacrificed like a calf. Cf. KTU 1.9?

40. Mot is speaking, and appears to be threatening the son whom Baal will father shortly after (ll. 22-25).

41. Ug. *wat*.

your winds, your lightnings[42], your rains,
(take) with you your seven divine assistants,
your eight boars,

1.5 v 10 (take) with you Pidray, daughter of Light,
(take) with you Taliy, daughter of Shower;

then set your face towards the mountain of my gullet[43].

Raise[44] the mountain on your hands,
the hill on top of your palms,

1.5 v 15 and go down into the house of the couch[45] of the earth,
be numbered among those who go down into the earth.
And you will know, god, that you are mortal.[46]'

Valiant Baal obeyed.

He loved a heifer in the pastureland[47],
a cow in the steppe by the shore of death[48].

42. Ug. *mdlk*. The basic sense of *mdl* is 'rope': Good (1984), Watson (1986). Cf. KTU 1.4 iv 4 and n. 121.

43. Ug. *knkny*. 'Tunnel': de Moor (1987: 78). Cf. *gngn* at KTU 1.4 vii 49 ('heart', but lit. 'gullet'). 'Grave': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 248, 'conjectural') and Gibson (1978: 72, 149, 'from context'). The 'libation-tube' interpretation of Schaeffer (1939a: 46-56) for this term and the structures discovered at Ugarit has recently been reassessed and found to be untenable. See Pitard (1994a) and Pardee (1996: 280). On the basis of these articles *DLU*, 148-49 (*gngn*) should be updated. I take this to allude to some natural cave on Mt Saphon which was understood to be an entrance to the underworld. Cf. the entrance to Hades at Cumae near Naples. Is the Ugaritic site that may be discerned here to be identified with *ḫlb gngnt* of KTU 1.91.22? The colon appears to identify a part of the mountain with Mot's gullet, and thus the whole mountain with Mot. This is not inconsistent with my proposal that Saphon is constructed out of the corpse of Yam: Wyatt (1995a: 226-27). Both gods represent the principles of chaos and dissolution.

44. 'Climb': Xella (1981: 135).

45. Cf. KTU 1.4 viii 7 and n. 176.

46. Ug. *wtd'.ilm.kmtt*. On the reading *ilm* for Virolleaud's *ill* see *CTA* (p. 36 n. 1). Xella (1981: 135) takes *ilm* to be 'the gods', as does Pardee (1997c: 267). I have taken it to be vocative with enclitic *m*. Reading *ill*, Driver (1956: 107, cf. n. 4: 'or "the weakness of a ghost"') has 'inanition', followed by Gibson (1978: 73); cf. de Moor (1971a: 183): 'weakness'.

47. Text *dbr*. Read perhaps <*arṣ*> *dbr*, as in KTU 1.5 vi 6 below (*KTU*^{2}).

48. Ug. *šḫl mmt*. See discussion in de Moor (1971a: 186). Explaining *šḫl* with ref. to Ar. *sāḥil*, 'shore, coast' after Dussaud (1935: 44 n. 1). Alternatively it may

1.5 v 20 He lay with her seventy-seven times,
she made him mount eighty-eight times.

And he [imp]regnated her
and she bore a young male[49];

Va[liant Baal] caused him to be clothed.

(3 illegible lines, followed by about 11 missing ones)

1.5 vi (about 30 lines missing, containing:)

[Then they set their faces indeed]

be explained with reference to Akk. *šalḫu*, Heb. *šelaḥ*, 'channel, stream', after Ginsberg (1936b: 53). Whichever explanation is accepted, the result is a ref. to the same cosmological point. This is the ocean which bounds the world. To cross it is to die. Cf. the exodus tradition, in which the Israelites cross the *yam sûp*, the 'sea of extinction' from the land of the dead, Egypt, to the land of the living, the promised land. Discussion in Wyatt (1996b: 84-89 and refs.). The idea was first outlined by Montgomery (1938). De Moor further explained the form *mmt* as *m-locale*. Perhaps the word, though undivided in the text, is to be construed *šḥlm mt*, with the final letter of *šḥlm* construed as an enclitic attached to a construct. As a fixed form it may simply have come to be written as one word. On the form *-m* cf. *bn ilm mt*, where *ilm* is sg.

49. Ug. *mṯ*. Various explanations have been offered: 'twin' (Akk. *mašu*): de Moor (1969b: 106-107), followed by Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 249 n. m, but text 'a young male'); cf. Gibson (1978: 72), del Olmo (1981a: 221); 'male (?)': Margalit (1980: 122). Cf. also Eg. *ms*, Heb. *mōšê*. 'Serpent': Astour (1967: 229-33), from Sum. *Muš*. He identifies this 'serpent' with the ophic deity Ninazu, and him in turn with *Rpu B'l*, the deity invoked in KTU 1.108. This dragon-deity, vehicle of Marduk, appears to have been nothing other than the *Labbû*-serpent in origin, the *mušḫuššu* overcome by Tishpak, and is thus ultimately an analogue of Baal's opponent! See Wiggermann (1989: 123) and Wyatt (1998a). Since no other portion of the extant text elaborates on the identity of *mṯ*, any solution remains conjectural. The f. form *mṯt* occurs at KTU 1.14 iii 9 etc., as an epithet of Hurriy and at KTU 1.17 v 16 of Dantiy. See n. 167 at KTU 1.15 iv 3. The problem with identifying the two is that *mṯ* here is evidently a bull-calf (clothed?!), while Hurriy is clearly human, as is Dantiy. I have adopted the view of Caquot and Sznycer as the least contentious for the two contexts. The 'young male' will become a 'youth', the pair-word for 'maiden' used of the two royal wives. See also n. 95 to KTU 1.14 iii 39 and n. 75 to KTU 1.17 v 16. Remarkably, the whole conception and birth sequence lying behind KTU 1.17 i 39–ii 47 is without any reference to Dantiy by name. She appears merely anonymously and functionally(!) as 'his wife' (*aṯth*) in col. i 39. The romance implicit in the description of Hurriy (who must be wooed and won) is entirely missing.

[towards El at the source of the rivers]
[at the midst of the springs of the two deeps.]

1.5 vi 1 [They rolled back the tent of El]
and came [to the pavilion of the King, the Father of] the Bright One.

[They lifted up their voices and cri]ed:

'We travelled to [the ends of the earth],
1.5 vi 5 to the edge of the abyss;

we came to "Paradise"[50] the land of pasture,
to "Delight", the steppe[51] by the shore of death.

We came upon Baal fallen to the earth:

dead was Valiant Baal,
1.5 vi 10 perished was the Prince, Lord of the earth!'

Then the Wise One, the perceptive god,
went down from his throne:
he sat on his footstool.
And from his footstool
he sat on the ground.[52]

50. Ug. *n'my*. I have translated the related form *n'm* as 'Paradise' at KTU 1.10 iii 31. But the present location seems at first glance to be scarcely paradisal, being on the threshold of the land of the dead. Is it an 'anti-paradise', a negative counterpart? Probably not: paradise is a point of intersection of two realms. On the paradox see Wyatt (1996b: 56-70, 96-100).

51. 'Paradise ... land || Delight ... steppe': alternatively to be taken as a superlative construction, according to Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 250): 'the most agreeable of pasturelands ... the most beautiful of meadows'. Cf. n. 67 at KTU 1.17 ii 41-42.

52. The two stages of El's descent conform to the imagery of Isa. 66.1 ('heaven is my throne | and the earth is my footstool'), except that a third level is implied: if El's throne is heaven and his footstool earth, then the 'ground' (*arṣ*) must be the underworld. The usual Heb. division (*šāmayim*, *tēbēl*, *'ereṣ*) does not however correspond to Ug. usage, where *arṣ* is ambiguous, having a double sense (though this ambiguity is found in Heb. too). El's descent is a ritual counterpart to Baal's. This element is not present in the parallel description of Anat's response. For discussion of the implications of this language for divine rank see Kruger (1995). Note also that El recapitulates in his mourning behaviour the descent of Baal into the underworld, which in turn was no doubt modelled on real burial rites. For the descent of the last King Niqmad (III or IV) see KTU 1.161.20-26.

1.5 vi 15 He poured the ashes of affliction on his head,
the dust of grovelling on his skull[53].
For clothing he put on a loin-cloth[54].

His skin with a stone he scored,
his side-locks[55] with a razor;
he gashed cheeks and chin.[56]

1.5 vi 20 He ploughed his collar-bones,
he turned over like a garden his chest,
like a valley he ploughed his breast[57].[58]

53. 'Ashes...dust': Ug. *'mr*, *'pr*. The first term is variously interpreted. *'mr*: 'ashes', del Olmo (1981a: 222, 601); 'ears', de Moor (1971a: 191): cf. Heb. *'ōmer*, 'sheaf' (and presumably English 'emmer'?). This amounts to a ritual self-burial. Cf. Job 2.12. An agricultural approach is less convincing. Pardee (1997c: 268 n. 240) notes that this bicolon is not repeated when Anat mourns below.

54. That is, he remains barely decent: almost a symbolic nakedness. A change of clothes is frequently symbolic (cf. Gen. 37.23; 41.14; 2 Kgs 25.29). El provides the paradigm for the human institution.

55. Ug. *psltm*. Cf. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 251), Margalit (1980: 129): 'twin-braids' (after *WUS* 258, §2241, Akk. *pasālu*, 'be twisted'). 'Flint': de Moor (1971a: 193: Ug. *psl*, 'cutter of stone or wood', JAram. *p^{e}sūlâ*, 'chip'), Gibson (1978: 73: Heb. *pāsal*, 'hewed'). The translation choice made here affects the interpretation of the following colon, since *lḥm* on the above approach would be redundant as 'side-whiskers' (de Moor 1971a: 190, 193). This in turn has a knock-on effect for interpreting Anat's behaviour.

56. This and the following tricolon take the description of El's mourning to its ritual culmination. Self-mutilation is a classic expression of grief and guilt (both emotions are present at funerals!). El gouges his skin with a stone. Cf. Job 2.8. He also shaves. The prohibition against these actions in Lev. 19.27-28 and Deut. 14.1 presupposes that this was hitherto normal practice. An important symbolic aspect may be that to break the skin is to destroy the boundary between self and not-self, thus inviting the irruption of chaos. Boundaries must be maintained! See Job 7.5. Cutting of the hair 'killed' it, again reinforcing the sense of sharing in the experience of the dead. See refs. in de Moor (1971a: 193). In the final colon, 'cheeks and chin' (Ug. *lḥm wdqn*) is translated 'side-whiskers and beard' by some, e.g. de Moor (1971a: 190, 193).

57. Ug. *bmt*. Or: 'back'.

58. This tricolon takes up the ritual behaviour of the previous one and applies a powerful agricultural metaphor. El's self-mutilation is on a heroic scale. For detailed philological notes on El's mourning see de Moor (1971a: 190-95). The seasonal interpretation which follows (pp. 195-96), however, turns the meaning of the text on its head, by turning it into a metaphor *for* agriculture, that is, the reverse

He lifted up his voice and cried:

'Baal is dead!
What has become of the Powerful One?
The Son of Dagan!
1.5 vi 25 What has become of Tempest?[59]

After Baal I shall go down into the underworld.[60]'

Anat also went out,
and searched every mountain in the midst of the earth,
every hill in the midst of the steppe.

She came to 'Para[dise', the land of] pasture,
1.5 vi 30 'Delight', the steppe by the [shore of] death.

She f[ound] Baal,
fall[en to the ea]rth[61].

[For clothing] she put on a loin[-cloth].

1.6 i 1 (Concerning Baal)[62]

Her skin with a stone she scored,
her side-locks [with a razor],
she gashed cheeks and chin[63].

of the way in which the figure is working. No calendrical significance is to be gleaned from the text. The prosody of both tricola, in terms of the grouping of the words and syntax of each unit, remains uncertain. The above reflects de Moor (1971a: 190; 1987: 80-81), Gibson (1978: 73) and del Olmo (1981a: 222). Contrast Margalit (1980: 129) and Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 250-51). This last is implausible.

59. For the prosody of this tetracolon, and alternative approaches, see Wyatt (1992a: 412-15). Cf. also KTU 1.2 i 18-19, 34-5. It looks like a hymnic excerpt.

60. Thus Baal's death presages other deaths. This also has the appearance of a liturgical phrase, perhaps reproduced from real funeral ceremonies. Cf. n. 40 at KTU 1.161.20, where Niqmad III (IV?) is being laid to rest.

61. Or: 'into the underworld'. Cf. l. 25. Should this be followed by the following bicolon (adapted from KTU 1.5 vi 14-16)?

<She poured the ashes of affliction on her head,
the dust of grovelling on her skull.>

62. Tablet labelling note.

63. This colon has raised much discussion, since on the translation of de Moor *et al.* it appears to attribute a beard to Anat. But on the approach I have taken this is not a necessary conclusion. In any case, we have the mechanical application of

She [ploughed] her collar-bones,
1.6 i 5 she turned over like a garden her chest,
like a valley she ploughed her breast.

'Baal is dead!
What has become of the Powerful One?
The Son of Dagan!
What has become of Tempest?

After Baal we shall go down into the underworld.'[64]

With her went down the Luminary of the gods, Shapsh[65].
Until she was sated she wept,
1.6 i 10 like wine she drank (her) tears.

Aloud she cried to the Luminary of the gods, Shapsh:

'Pray, load on to me Valiant Baal!'

The Luminary of the gods, Shapsh, obeyed:

she lifted up Valiant Baal;
1.6 i 15 on to the shoulders of Anat did she set him.

formulaic language, as with El, rather than a text tailored to Anat's needs, beyond the form of the vbs. See in particular Loewenstamm (1974, 1982) and Marcus (1977).

64. Anat's response to Baal's death is exactly the same as El's, except that it lacks the first two elements in his reaction, the descent from the throne (KTU 1.5 vi 12-14) and the use of ashes and dust (KTU 1.5 vi 14-16, see n. 61). It however goes on to record the burial and sacrificial rites. The result is a fairly extended case of narrative staircase parallelism, the structure being a:b:c:d:e:f:c1:d1:e1:f1:g:h. This highlights the cooperation of El and Anat. This is probably a fairly accurate description of actual mourning behaviour, in effect an expression on the one hand of solidarity with the deceased, and on the other of the hope that by going through the ritual motions of death, the catastrophe itself can be averted, with regard both to the dead and the mourner. The rites are also part of the psychological process of acceptance. Needless to say, a seasonal interpretation of Anat's mourning (e.g. de Moor 1971a: 200-201; 1987: 82) is inappropriate.

65. Shapsh's apparently subordinate role in the episode beginning here is misleading. As sun-goddess, she goes nightly into the underworld, and as is clear both from her role in subduing Mot in KTU 1.6 vi 22-35 and the closing hymn of KTU 1.6 vi 42-53, she has a pivotal role in restoring the *status quo*, in effect maintaining cosmic equilibrium. See also her role in KTU 1.23, where she is geminated into the forms of Athirat and Rahmay. Her role here is the powerful one of the psychopomp: she restores Baal when Anat (and El) cannot, just as she subdues Mot when Baal cannot do so.

She took him up into the uttermost parts of Saphon,

she wept for him
and buried him.

She placed him in a grave of the gods of the underworld[66].

She slaughtered seventy wild bulls
1.6 i 20 [as a fun]eral offering[67] for Valiant Baal.

She slaughtered seventy oxen
as a funeral offering for Valiant Baal.

[she slaugh]tered seventy sheep
[as a fu]neral offering for Valiant Baal.

[She slau]ghtered seventy stags
1.6 i 25 [as a funeral offering for] Valiant Baal.

[She slaughtered se]venty mountain-goats
[as a funeral offering for Val]iant Baal.

[She slaughtered seventy an]telopes[68]
[as a funeral offer]ing for Valiant Baal.

66. Ug. *bḫrt ilm.arṣ*. Or: 'in a mighty cavern in the earth (underworld)'.

67. Ug. *kgmn*. 'Funeral offering'. Tentative suggestion, following del Olmo (1981a: 533, Akk. *kamānu*). Cf. Dietrich and Loretz (1967: 538), who cite Hur. *kukumnu*, 'three year-old animal' (see *AHw*, 501). Cf. extensive refs. in de Moor (1971a: 199), many scholars having cited Heb. *g^{e}mūl*, which raises difficulties. He (1971a: 199; 1987: 83) construes as 'because [Baal] had been defiled' (D stem of √*gmn*, cf. Eth. *gammana*, 'to profane, defile', *g^{e}mūn*, 'defiled, unclean'). Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 254-55) leave untranslated. *UT* 380, §19.591: 'a kind of sacrifice for the dead'. *WUS* 66, §663: 'refreshment' (Ar. *ǧamma*, 'rest, gather strength'), followed by Margalit (1980: 141-42), 'nourishment'; *DLU* 147: 'funeral offering'. Watson (1989) advises caution, though suggesting 'as mourning'. Cf. Watson 1996b.

68. Text [*ṭṭbḫ.šb'm y*]*ḥmrm*. Thus *KTU*^{2} against *CTA*, *KTU*^{1}. For completion of [*y*]*ḥmrm*, 'antelopes' rather than reading *ḥmrm* as the complete word, 'donkeys', see Ginsberg (1950: 158; 1973: 131-32 with refs.). 'Donkeys': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 255; n. e rejects Ginsberg) and del Olmo (1981a: 224). 'Roebucks', de Moor (1987: 84 and n. 406, citing Ginsberg 1973: 131-32); de Moor and Spronk (1987: 37) restore the *y*. Again rejected by Pardee (1997c: 268 n. 242). If 'donkeys' be preferred, note comments at n. 17 to KTU 1.40.26. The term used there for sacrificial donkeys is however not *ḥmr*, but *'r*.

1.6 i 30 Her [sacrifi]ce she placed in the fu[rrows],
her [off]ering(?) as a gift for the god(s).

[The]n indeed she set her face
towards El at the source of the rivers,
at the midst of the springs of the two deeps.

1.6 i 35 She rolled back the tent of El
and came to the pavilion of the king, the Father of the Bright One.

At the feet of El she bowed and fell down,
she paid him homage and honoured him.

She lifted up her voice and cried:

'Let her rejoice now[69],
1.6 i 40 Athirat and her sons,
the goddess and the band of her kinsmen!

For dead is Valiant Baal,
for perished is the Prince, Lord of the Earth!'

Aloud cried El to the Great Lady-who-tramples-Yam:
1.6 i 45 'Listen, O Great Lady-who-tramples-Yam.

Give the first[70] of your sons;
I shall make him king[71].'

69. What amounts from the perspective of a systematic theology to a theological tension between the different symbolic functions of the gods is typically represented in the mythological idiom as rivalries between different groups among the gods. The tensions of the Iliad are treated in the same way. Handy's bureaucratic model of the pantheon (1994) fails precisely when it comes to an assessment of conflicts of interest of this kind. He regards it as a breakdown of the system. It is on the contrary the basic working of the system. Cf. Wyatt (1996b: 327-30, 1998b). The world is first of all processed through human analogues. Cf. the archaic pattern described by Mithen (1996: 48-49), which forms the basis of mythic structures. The tension here is a dramatic one, and does not indicate a different genealogy for Anat, who is herself El's daughter: KTU 1.3 iv [54], v 10, 27 (= 1.18 i 16).

70. Ug. *aḥd*. Normally construed as 'one (of your sons)', but rather to be taken as ordinal: 'the first...'. Cf. the ordinal use of *'eḥād* at Gen. 1.5, corresponding to the *šēnî*, *šᵉlîšî* of the series, and cf. Ruth 1.4 (*ha'aḥat...haššēnît*). The pattern here for royal succession appears to be matrilineal, the first son of the chief wife succeeding the father. Cf. Solomon's similar destiny (Wyatt 1985b).

71. As he had made Yam king (KTU 1.1 iv 13-32), and presumably, perhaps at the end of 1.4 viii, Baal too on the completion of his palace.

And the Great Lady-who-tramples-Yam replied:
'Shall we not make king one who has knowledge and wit[72]?'

1.6 i 50 And the Compassionate, god of mercy, replied:

'Let the finest of pigments be ground,
let the people of Baal prepare unguents,
the people of the the Son of Dagan crushed herbs.'[73]

The Great Lady-who-tramples-Yam replied:

'Indeed, let us make Athtar the Brilliant king:
1.6 i 55 Athtar the Brilliant shall rule!'

Then Athtar the Brilliant went up into the uttermost parts of Saphon;
he sat on the throne of Valiant Baal.

[But] his feet did not reach the footstool;
1.6 i 60 his head did not come up to its top[74].
Then Athtar the Brilliant said:

'I shall not rule in the uttermost parts of Saphon!'

Athtar the Brilliant came down,
he came down from the throne of Valiant Baal,

1.6 i 65 and ruled in the earth[75],

72. Ug. *yd'.ỿlḥn*. Margalit (1980: 143, 145) understands this to be the name (or epithet: 'He who knows how to make moisture', in accordance with his seasonal view) of a candidate for the throne, with El's response applying to him as a disqualification. Athtar is then Athirat's second nominee, who *is* acceptable to El. In my view he is the only candidate. His epither '*rṣ* is usually construed as 'tyrant', 'terrible' or variations on the theme. I have followed Gray (1965: 66 n. 4) and Craigie (1973: 223). See Wyatt (1996b: 41 and n. 43).

73. Wyatt (2001b, 599 n. 7), following Virolleaud (1931), Emerton (1965) and Day (1998: 81 and n. 23), rather than following the broad consensus as in first edition, and in Gibson (1978: 75), Pardee (1997c: 269). For 'people' perhaps read 'kinsmen' (Ug. *'m*).

74. Sc. the top of the backrest, the *nḫt* of KTU 1.1 iv [24]: see n. 56 *ad loc*. There is no need to read here a satire on Athtar. Rather should it be compared with 1 Sam. 17.39, where David cannot wear Saul's armour.

75. Ug. *arṣ*. Here denoting the earth. Athtar becomes 'king of the world', implicitly ruling from sea to sea. He is the apotheosis of the human institution of kingship (Wyatt 1986b, 1989b). The present section of the narrative is the paradigm of the 'royal ascent', which is the mythological account of how a king obtains his

god of it all.

[they d]rew water from amphorae,
[they drew] water from vases[76].

1.6 ii (about 30 lines missing)

1.6 ii 1 (4 lines fragmentary)

[ ]
[ ]
[ ]

1.6 ii 5 [A day, two days] passed,
and the wo[mb[77] of Anat] sought him.

As the heart of a cow to her calf,
as the heart of a ewe to her lamb,

authority and wisdom from the gods in heaven, before returning to earth to exercise authority. On this see Wyatt (1986a; 1996b: 307-22, 341-45). There is no warrant for seeing the present episode as itself a deposition myth (thus, e.g., Page 1996), even though it is thematically linked to such passages as Isa. 14.9-15, Ezek. 28.2-10, 12-19, which develop the deposition theme. The seasonal interpretation, which sees Athtar as an irrigation-god replacing Baal as storm-god as the source of the land's fertility during the summer (thus, e.g., Gaster 1961: 120-27; de Moor 1971a: 205-206; 1987: 107; Margalit 1980: 149-50; 1996, 179-80) is in my view a complete misunderstanding of the text. The successor to Baal is actually Mot, the three deities Yam, Baal and Mot representing in their conflicts the intra-pantheonic tensions among the second-level gods under the overall aegis of El. Athtar represents a tertiary level, the human world, whose institutions are subject to pressures from above and below. We might have a more adequate understanding of Athtar's role in the Baal Cycle were the text complete.

76. This appears to be an allusion to a ritual accompanying Athtar's enthronement. The dispensing of water, a vital matter in the management of the kingdom, is one of the king's first acts. Cf. Ps. 110.7; Num. 20.8-11 (where Moses acts like a king). In parting the waters, Exod. 15.1-8, Moses may also betray something of the general water-symbolism of the *Chaoskampf* as appropriated in royal rituals. (See Wyatt 1998a.) But not every drop of water is to be understood seasonally!

77. Ug. *r*[*ḥm*]. Not 'maiden (Anat)' as so often supposed (e.g. Gibson 1978: 76: 'damsel'; similarly del Olmo 1981a: 226), but rather the goddess's womb as the seat of her emotions. Her instinctive reaction here is maternal and protective. Cf. adj. *raḥûm* (qal pass. pt., ep. of deity) n. *raḥ^{a}mayim* (commonly ep. of deity) and denom. vb *riḥam* based on the n. in Heb. See KTU 1.19 i 1-9, where Anat's maternal and savage instincts are in conflict.

so the heart of Anat went out to Baal.

She seized Mot by the edge of his garment,
she grasped [him] by the end of his robe.

She lifted up her voice and cried:
'Come[78], Mot, give (me) my brother!'

But divine Mot replied:

'What do you ask of me, O Virgin Anat?

I went out myself,
and searched every mountain in the midst of the earth,
every hill in the midst of the steppe.

My appetite felt the want of human beings,
my appetite the multitudes of the earth.

I reached "Paradise", the land of pasture,
"Delight", the steppe by the shore of death.

It was I who approached[79] Valiant Baal:
it was I who offered him up[80] <like> a lamb in my mouth.
Like a kid in the opening of my maw.

It was he who <was> carried away by the Luminary of the gods, Shapsh!
by the Burning One, strength of the heavens,
into the hand(s) of the divine Mot!'[81]

A day, two days passed,
days (turned) to months.

78. Ug. *at*. Taking it as √*atw*, 'to come'. See Dressler (1979: 216). Cf. KTU 1.1 iii 16.

79. The suggestion of Cathcart and Watson (1980: 41) that this may be *ngš*, 'oppress' (cf. Heb. *nāgaś*) rather than 'approach' (Heb. *nāgaš*) is attractive. See n. 39 at KTU 1.114.19.

80. Ug. *'dbnn*. The cultic use of the vb is to be understood here, as at KTU 1.4 viii 17. Cf. KTU 1.4 vi 39-40. There is no evidence from Ugarit of cult being offered to Mot. Perhaps this is part of the irony here, that Baal himself, recipient of so many offerings, will himself become the sacrificial victim of Mot, the unworshipped, the all-devourer. Here the sacrificial image is of course a metaphor for death.

81. For the same formula see KTU 1.3 v 17-18 (restored). Slight variation at KTU 1.4 viii 23-24. Mot claims that Shapsh helped him in his devouring of Baal.

The womb of Anat sought him.

As the heart of a cow to her calf,
as the heart of a ewe to her lamb,
1.6 ii 30 so the heart of Anat went out to Baal.

She seized divine Mot.

With a knife she split him;
with a fan she winnowed him[82];
with fire she burnt him;
with millstones she ground him;
<with a sieve she sifted him;>
on the steppe <she abandoned him;
1.6 ii 35 in the sea> she sowed him.[83]

82. Ug. *bḫṯr.tdry*. Watson (1996b) suggests tentatively that *ḫṯr* be interpreted by reference to Hur. *ḫateri*, 'dagger, knife', and *dry* as 'cut' (see Watson [1995a: 220], √*adr*, corresponding to Phoen. *azr*, but cf. *DLU* [pp. 10, 138]) yielding the following parallelism:

b ḥrb tbq'nn	with a sword she split him,
bḫṯr tdrynn	with a blade she cut him.

Were these cola unrelated to the rest of the series this might be an attractive option, but the heptacolon surely lists seven *different* things done to Mot. Any repetition would diminish the cumulative effect of Anat's actions. See next note.

83. This unusual heptacolon is to be partially restored on the basis of KTU 1.6 v 11-19. The sevenfold structure (not a fivefold one as supposed by Watson 1979a: 117) serves to emphasize the total efficacy of the process applied to Mot: he is destroyed seven times. The apparently ritual procedure followed here by Anat has proved a crux for the overall interpretation of KTU 1.1–1.6. It has been taken seriously as a sequence of agricultural procedures, as for instance by Hvidberg (1962: 51): 'Anat's killing of Mot... represents the harvest'. See also Virolleaud (1931), Ginsberg (1932, 1950) Albright (1969: 84) and de Moor (1971a: 212-15, with extensive refs.). Others have rejected this view, notably Loewenstamm (1962, 1972 and 1975). It is to be seen rather as a rite of annihilation, with several parallels, such as PT 292, Plutarch *De Iside* 73, Sennacherib's punishment of his grandfather's assassins (*ANET*, 288), and the destruction of the golden calf (Exod. 32.20). The principle textual element which might be thought to support the former view is the omission of the sequence 'she abandoned him, in the sea' at the end of KTU 1.6 ii 34, which then brought the words *bšd* and *tdr'nn* together. This is widely supposed to mean 'in the field she scattered him' (thus, e.g., Gibson 1978: 77), or 'in the field she sowed him' (thus, e.g., de Moor 1987: 89), whereas the *šd*, lit. 'steppe', is hardly the place for *sowing* grain. At least 'scattering' gives the better sense of waste, but is in any event to be harmonized with KTU 1.6 v 18-19,

His remains the birds did indeed eat,
his scraps[84] the sparrows did indeed consume.
remains to remains cried out[85].

1.6 iii (about 40 lines missing)

'...
[For dead is Valiant Baal,]
1.6 iii 1 for perished is the Prin[ce, Lord of the earth!]
But if V[aliant Baal] should be alive,
and if the Prince, Lo[rd of the earth] should exist
in a dream of the Wise One, the perceptive god,
1.6 iii 5 in a vision[86] of the Creator of Creatures,
let the skies rain oil,

as above. If there is *any* real agricultural procedure intended in these lines, I suggest that it is the language of brewing (cracking and parching the grain), which evokes the Egyptian myth of the destruction of mankind and the drunkenness of Hathor, who wades in beer, thinking it to be blood. See Wilson (1969: 11) and Lichtheim (1997). But the improbability of the procedures is more likely to be the real sense of the passage. I find Richardson's (1973: 17-18) attempt to account for the difference between the two texts less convincing than the harmonization proposed here. A study appearing too late for inclusion in the present discussion is Mazzini (1997).

84. 'Scraps...remains', rather than 'flesh...limbs'. Ug. *širh...mnth*. Cf. the distinct Heb. terms *śᵉʾār*, 'residue' and *śᵉʾēr*, 'flesh'. *WUS* (p. 299, §2570) allows either; *UT* (p. 487, §19.2372) only the latter. For *mnt*, (cf. Heb. √*mîn*), the basic sense is division, which allows either nuance. Del Olmo (1981: 228) combines the two: 'flesh...scraps'. But the Ug. term for 'flesh' is *ṯir*. This makes Pardee's (1997c: 270 and n. 258) point immaterial. Scraps hardly 'grow fat'.

85. Mot's fragments have been scattered and devoured, but *not* ritually buried, and with Death himself this is not good enough. This colon may presage Mot's subsequent revival and return to the fray, for it suggests a soul that is restless and not pacified. Cf. KTU 1.17 i 27, and the broader question of Aqhat's destiny in KTU 1.19. Anat specifically leaves the hero unburied, with the result that he is devoured by the mother-falcon Sumul. It takes Danel's intervention to assure his proper burial.

86. Ug. *bḏrt*. See Tropper (1996a), who argues that it is a by-form of **bḏhrt*. El's dream is the type of the seer's dream: he sees in his mind's eye that which will be hereafter. Things experienced in dreams were regarded by the ancients as being as real as waking experience.

let the wadis run with honey![87]

And I shall know that Valiant Baal is alive,
that the Prince, Lord of the earth, exists!'

1.6 iii 10 In a dream of the Wise One, the perceptive god,
in a vision of the Creator of Creatures

the skies rained oil,
the wadis ran with honey.[88]

The Wise One, the perceptive god, rejoiced.
1.6 iii 15 His feet on the footstool he placed;
He unfurrowed his brow and laughed.

He lifted up his voice and cried:

'At last I may sit down and rest,
and my soul[89] can rest in my breast!

1.6 iii 20 For alive is Valiant Baal,
for the Prince, Lord of the earth, exists!'[90]

Aloud he cried to Virgin Anat:

'Listen, O Virgin Anat!

Say to the Luminary of the god<s>, Shapsh:

1.6 iv 1 "Search[91] the wells[92] of the steppe, O Shapsh, .

87. This dream presages a paradisal restoration. Cf. the biblical formula 'a land flowing with milk and honey'. Cf. however E. Levine 1986 on the latter formula.

88. Baal is not yet alive again: the present supernatural manifestation of plenty is a portent of his restoration to come. See below.

89. Ug. *npš*. Perhaps more literally, 'my lung(s)' (du.)? The term can denote 'thorax, throat, appetite' etc. The point is that bodily organs reflect emotional states, as with livers, wombs and hearts. Perhaps El has been suffering from breathlessness and palpitations. The gods are credited generally with every human emotion, as with the reactions of goddesses to perceived bad news (KTU 1.3 iii 33-35; 1.4 ii 16-20).

90. El draws this conclusion from the portent, according to the logic of ll. 2-3, 6-7, now reversed in ll. 12-13, 20-21.

91. Ug. *pl*. Following Ginsberg (1936b: 64), Dussaud (1934: 204), and Margalit (1980: 170), who see here the Ar. and MHeb. √*ply/plh*, 'to search'. The basic sense behind this is seen in Heb. *pālâ*, Niph. 'to be separated, distinct'. 'Cracked': de Moor (1971a: 220-21: full bibliography to date); similarly Gibson (1978: 155), Ar. *falla*, or 'waterless desert', Ar. *fallu*, and del Olmo (1981a: 610): Ar. *fallu*, *'afalla*. 'Made ragged. destroyed': Aartun (1985: 14 §84): √*pll* pass. *UT*, 468 §19.2042: = ESA *flt*, pl. *'fl*, 'trench, excavation', or perhaps *p* + *l*; *WUS*, 255 §2219, √*pl*:

search the wells of the vast steppe[93].

Baal has forsaken[94] the furrows of the ploughland[95].
Where is Valiant Baal?
1.6 iv 5 Where is the Prince, Lord of the earth?"'

Virgin Anat departed.
Then she set her face towards the Luminary of the gods, Shapsh.

She lifted up her voice and cried:
1.6 iv 10 'Message of Bull El, your father[96],

'trickle'. De Moor's objection to the proposal adopted (Shapsh will have to look in the underworld) is obviated as soon as the rhetorical nature of the command is understood, or even a ritual *Sitz im Leben* if that is where the search motif has its origins. Besides, wells are not cracked like furrows (see next note), and Shapsh's response in l. 20 (*abqṯ*: 'I shall search...') is consonant with the line taken here.

92. Ug. *'nt*. 'Wells' here and in l. 2, but 'furrows' in l. 3. So already Virolleaud (1931: 216). Many (e.g., de Moor 1971a: 220; Gibson 1978: 78; del Olmo 1981a: 229) translate the first two occurrences as 'furrows' as well. But this is inappropriate: steppeland (*šd*) is the place for pasturing, and hence wells for watering sheep; *šd* is contrasted here with *mḥrṯt*, 'ploughland', in l. 3. Baal is lord of both grazing and arable land. Both depend on his beneficent activity. This is to recognize the importance of Baal for the economic life of Ugarit; it falls far short of providing evidence for a specifically *seasonal* view of his role, or at any rate of this narrative. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 262-63) translate the expressions *'nt šd...'nt mḥrṯt* as 'Anat of the fields...Anat of the ploughlands', making heavy weather of them. Fensham (1981: 53), appealing to Johnstone (1969: 315), insists that *šd* means the farmland round a city, but in the passage he discusses, KTU 1.14 ii 51–iii 1, the phrase is *šd* || *pat mdbr*, 'steppe...edge of the desert'.

93. Baal cannot really be dead at all, El appears to be saying, in spite of the fact that he was buried (KTU 1.6 i 17). It is now a matter of searching for him.

94. Ug. *yštk*. Following Ginsberg (1969: 141), Gaster (1961: 223) and Avishur (1972: 2): 'neglect'. Other views: 'provide for': Driver (1956: 113), sc. √*škn* II Gt (or *k*[*w*]*n* Št?); 'the furrows of the ploughland *lament over* Baal': Hvidberg (1962: 36), √*škw* Gt, 'complain'; 'Ba'lu has to make...': de Moor (1971a: 220), √*yšt* juss. (final *n* 'a wrong conjecture'); 'Baal should be occupying...': Gibson (1978: 78, 158), √*škn* Gt; 'is Baal visible (?)...': Margalit (1980: 169-70), √*šky* (JAram., MHeb. *sky*, 'look out'); 'did they make you "Lord"...?': del Olmo (1981a: 230), √*šṯ* (cf. de Moor 1971a). See Pardee (1997c: 271 n. 262).

95. Ug. *mḥrṯt*. See Loretz (1993) and de Moor (1995: 5 n. 26).

96. 'Your father' (*abk*): not merely a routine formula. In KTU 1.23.32-33 El is the father and mother (as well as the husband) of the goddesses Athirat and Rahmay, who together form hypostases of the sun (Wyatt 1996b: 227-29).

word of the Wise One, your sire:

"Search the wells of the steppe, O Shapsh,
search the wells of the vast steppe.

Baal has forsaken the furrows of the ploughland.

1.6 iv 15 Where is Valiant Baal?
Where is the Prince, Lord of the earth?"'

And the Luminary of the gods, Shapsh, replied:

'Pour out sparkling wine[97] from the chalice[98].
Let your kinsmen bring garlands[99],

1.6 iv 20 and I shall search for Valiant Baal.'

And Virgin Anat replied:

'Wherever, O Shapsh,
wherever (you go)[100] may El ke[ep you],
may [the gods] keep you in pe[ace]!'[101]

97. Ug. *šd yn.'n*. Lit. 'pour (√*šdy*) wine of an eye': thus Driver (1956: 113), de Moor (1971a: 223), Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 264), Gibson (1978: 78, citing Prov. 23.31) and del Olmo (1981a: 230). Aistleitner (*WUS*, 303 §2584): 'I lift up my eyes at [your] behest'. Margalit (1980: 171-72, reading *šdyn.'n*): 'I'll cast an eye'. His objection to the approach taken here is misguided. We have a classic libation rite.

98. Ug. *bqbt* (*CTA*, *KTU*[1]), *bqb't* (*KTU*[2]). Initial *b* is 'from' rather than 'in'. To *qbt* cf. also Akk. *qabūtu*; to *qb't* (cf. Heb. *qubba'at*) note same form in KTU 1.19 iv 53, 55 (*ks* || *qb't*) and *qb'*, 'cup, goblet' (Hoftijzer and Jongeling [1994: 983]). *WUS*, 273 §2388: Akk. *qibītu*. Margalit (1980: 171-72): 'from the dome of the world' (Ar. *qubbat*, 'cupola, dome'). But a chalice is also dome-shaped.

99. Ug. *lyt*. Construed as 'garland, wreath' (cf. Heb. *liwyâ*): thus Virolleaud (1931: 217), followed by Driver (1956: 113), de Moor (1971a: 224), Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 264) and Gibson (1978: 78). 'Anxiety': Gray (1957: 72 n. 4); 'curse': Hvidberg (1962: 37 n. 3), reading **ulyt*, Ar. *'ulwatu*, Heb. *'ālâ*; 'bulge (of your mother's suckling)'(!): Margalit (1980: 171, 173), Ar. *layya*, 'bend, fold'; 'suite, retinue': del Olmo (1981a: 230, 572), √*lwy*, Heb. *nilwâ*.

100. Ug. *an.l.an*. Virolleaud (1931: 218) cites Heb. *'ān*, 'where?' or 'whither?' (interrog.) So *WUS*, 26 §293 (citing Ar. *'annā*). Cf. Driver (1956: 113). Others rel. 'where(soe)ver' or similar: de Moor (1971a: 223-24), Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 264), Gibson (1978: 78), del Olmo (1981a: 230) and *DLU*, 37. Margalit (1980: 171, 173): 'from strength to strength', followed by Watson (1983: 158).

101. Text *tġrk.*šlm[ ] (*KTU*[2]). With up to six signs missing, any restoration is conjectural. The vb *tġrk* is either 3 du. or 3 pl. (*nġr* G: 'protect'). In the former case

(1 fragmentary line, followed by about 38 missing lines)

1.6 v 1 Baal seized the sons of Athirat.
The great ones he smote with a blade[102],
the brilliant ones[103] he smote with a mace,
the small ones he smote to the earth.

1.6 v 5 And Baal went up to the throne of his kingship,
[to the back-rest], to the siege of his dominion.[104]

perhaps restore **šḥr*: 'May Shalem [and Shahar] protect you'. These two deities are sons of Shapsh, so that the prayer invokes the protection of her father (and mother!) and husband on the one hand, and sons on the other. The normal arrangement of the DNs is however *šḥr wšlm* (e.g. KTU 1.23.53-54; 1.100.52, 1.107.43; 1.123.11), which reduces the likelihood of this solution. The alternative requires a parallel to *il*, such as *bn il* ('gods'), with *šlm* taken as an instr. acc. (double acc. construction). I have tentatively followed this line here. Cf. de Moor (1971a: 223) and Margalit (1980: 171-72).

102. Ug. *ktp*, 'blade', which can denote a scapula (as at KTU 1.2 iv 14, 16, cf. Heb. *kātēp*) or a weapon ('scimitar') as here. See O'Callaghan (1952), Bordreuil and Pardee (1993a: 68), Watson (1995a: 545) and Vita (1996: 442 n. 24).

103. Ug. *dkym*. This has been variously understood: de Moor (1971a: 227), Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 265 n. c) and del Olmo (1982: 68-69) list various options. I have here provisionally followed Gaster (1961: 224) and Driver (1956: 154), citing Ar. *ḏakîyu*, 'brilliant', in spite of de Moor. Renfroe (1992: 130) notes that no satisfactory solution has yet been found. The division *dk ym*, 'pounders of the sea' (cf. Dijkstra 1974: 64; Gibson 1978: 79) or 'those who were like Yam' (del Olmo 1981a: 231) are equally conjectural. Something intermediate between *rbm* ('great ones') and *ṣġrm* 'small ones') is required, in what looks like a ranking of the gods whom Baal kills. Wilfred Watson suggests to me tentatively that the meaning of *dkym* may perhaps be found in Akk. *dekû*, 'to mobilize' (see *CAD*, III [D], 123-28 [124, 126] *AHw*, 166-67) so that we would have the series 'great ones... warriors...small ones'. As we have members of the pantheon, perhaps denoting three ranks of gods in descending order, this would perhaps indicate that the second rank are military in character. In KTU 1.1–1.6 the second rank of gods appear to be the royal figures Yam, Baal, and Mot who exercise monarchical power under the aegis of El. Athtar, as representing human kingship (KTU 1.6 i 65—see n. 75) is on a lower level. Cf. the levels proposed by Petersen and Woodward (1977); in my view the position they allocate to Anat belongs to Athtar. But the etymology, and consequently interpretation, remains conjectural.

104. In the surviving text this is the first time that Baal actually occupies his throne. Cf. KTU 1.1 iv 24-25, 1.3 iv 1-3 and 1.6 vi 33-35 below. Occupancy of the throne is a central motif of the epic form of the tradition. See Wyatt (1996b: 36-43; 1996c). Binger (1997) arrived too late for full consideration in this study. However,

[da]ys (turned) to months,
months (turned) to years[105].

[Lo,] in the seventh year[106],
divine Mot [came]
1.6 v 10 towards Valiant Baal.

He lifted up his voice and cried:

'Because of you, O Baal, I experienced downfall.

Because of you I experienced winnowing with <a fan;
because of you I experienced splitting with>[107] a knife;
because of you I experienced burning with fire;
1.6 v 15 because of you I experienced grinding with millstones;
because of you I experienced sifting with a sieve;
because of you I experienced abandonment on the steppe;
because of you I experienced sowing in the sea[108].

1.6 v 20 Give the first[109] of your brothers (whom) I may eat,
and the anger I feel will depart.

If the first of your brothers you do not give,
then I shall seize [ ][110]

in view of her interesting discussion of this section (pp. 60-63), I append an alternative approach based on the first of her two analyses of the text:

Baal seized the sons of Athirat.
The mighty gods he smote.

With a blade he smote those resembling Yam;
with a mace he smote the underlings of Mot.

from the earth Baal went up
to the throne of his kingship,
[to the back-rest.]
to the siege of his domin[at]ion.

105. Lit. 'from days to months | from months to years'.

106. Cf. Gordon (1949: 4-5) on the sabbatical pattern.

107. Text corrected on the basis of KTU 1.6 ii 32-33. The actual text of the tablet cannot be left as a legitimate poetic variant: it merely makes no sense.

108. The form of this unit is another rare heptacolon (cf. KTU 1.6 ii 31-35 above and nn. 82, 83). It represents the total annihilation of Mot. Paradoxically, of course, he is not destroyed. As the sequel will show, he can only be tamed.

109. Ug. *aḥd*. On the ordinal use cf. KTU 1.6 i 46 and n. 70.

110. Cf. de Moor (1987: 95 n. 465).

(it will be) time I ate [mankind],
that I ate the multitud[es of the earth][111]!'

(4 illegible lines, followed by about 25 missing lines)

1.6 vi 1 '[dr]ive him out,
[ex]pel him.
[ ]
[ ]
1.6 vi 5 [ ] Mot,
[ ] the Powerful One.'
[ ] divine Mot,
[He ate] his seven divine assistants.
Divine Mot [cried]:
'Loo[k!]
1.6 vi 10 [It is] my brothers[112] whom Baal has given me for my meal,
my mother's sons for my consumption!'
He returned to Baal in the recesses of Saphon.
He lifted up[113] his voice and cried:
1.6 vi 15 'It is my brothers you have given me, Baal, for my meal,
my mother's sons for my consumption!'
They glowered at each other like burning coals.
Mot was strong;
Baal was strong.
They gored like wild bulls.
Mot was strong;
Baal was strong.
They bit like serpents.

111. Thus Baal is challenged to offer a substitute, so redeeming human victims from Mot's threat. Who 'the first of his brothers' is remains unclear. One possibility is that it is the first of the seven Baals of KTU 1.47.5-11 and parallels, that is Baal himself. Cf. also the putative son in KTU 1.9. Baal himself appears to fulfil some obscure self-sacrificial, atoning role in KTU 1.12 ii 46-49.

112. Baal appears to have tricked Mot into eating his own brothers.

113. Text *yšl*. Read *yšu* (*KTU*^{2}).

Mot was strong;
Baal was strong.

They tugged like hunting-dogs.

Mot fell.
Baal fell on top of him.[114]

Shapsh cried to Mot:

'Listen, pray, O divine Mot!

How can you fight with Valiant Baal?
How will Bull El your father not hear you?

He will surely pull down the pillars[115] of your dwelling,
he will surely overturn the throne of your kingship,
he will surely break the sceptre[116] of your rule!'

Divine <M>ot was afraid;
the Beloved of El, the hero was in dread.[117]
Mot started at her voice.

[He lifted up his voice and cried:]

'Let Baal be installed [on the throne of] his kingship,
on [the back-rest, on the siege of] his dominion!'[118]

(6 fragmentary lines)

Come, pray, to the fresh meat;
yes, eat the offering-bread;
pray drink the libation-wine.[119]

114. On this lively account of the fight between Baal and Mot see Dietrich and Loretz (1987a) and R.M. Good (1994).

115. Cf. van Zijl (1972: 80). 'Door-jambs': de Moor (1971a: 230). 'Support': Gibson (1978: 80).

116. The movement here ('pillars... throne... sceptre') is from the general to the particular as aspects of royal power.

117. Mot is not cowed by Baal, but trembles at the thought of offending Shapsh. She is mistress of heaven and the underworld, which she traverses nightly.

118. Thus Baal's arch-enemy and rival for the throne, in response to Shapsh's words, is himself the official announcer of Baal's rule.

119. The vbs here may be 2 sg. f. jussives, addressed to Shapsh, or 2 m. pl. jussives, addressed to all the gods.

Shapsh, you rule[120] the saviours[121];
Shapsh, you rule the chthonian gods.

Your company are the gods;
lo, mortals[122] are your company.[123]

Kothar is your associate,
1.6 vi 50 and Hasis is your companion.

120. Ug. *ṯḥtk*. To be taken as √*ḥtk*, 'to rule' (so de Moor 1971a: 240-41), and 2 f. sg. with Shapsh in apposition (as voc.) rather than 3 f. sg. with her as subject, in preference to prep. *ṯḥt* with 2 p. suff. (thus Virolleaud 1934a: 238; Caquot and Sznycer 1974: 270 n. i; Gibson 1978: 81 [but see n. 7]; Levine and de Tarragon 1984: 657). The latter would require *rpum*, not *rpim*, as the tablet reads. Healey (1980) suggests 'care for'. Cf. Renfroe (1992: 93). Like Dagan (KTU 6.13; 6.14), Shapsh is a recipient of *pgr* sacrifices (KTU 1.39.12, 17; 1.101.12) in accordance with her chthonian role outlined here. See discussion in Spronk (1986: 150). Schmidt (1994: 84-88) disputes the view that Shapsh actually enters the underworld.

121. I take this to be a hymn to Shapsh, following Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 270): '(?)'. Del Olmo (1981: 234-35), taking it to be one to Baal, translates this colon 'Shapsh will submit you to the Rephaim'. This is theologically implausible, since this would offend the matter of the relative ranking of the deities. See also n. 123. Cf., however, Husser's (1997) new argument in favour of this interpretation.

122. Ug. *mtm*. For choice of translation see next note. In this I agree with del Olmo (1981a: 235), 'men', rather than taking them to be 'dead' (thus de Moor 1971a: 240; Caquot and Sznycer 1974: 270; Gibson 1978: 81). In so far as the hymn addresses Shapsh's journey through the underworld, it may however be understood to include the dead, in a kind of 'community of saints', a nuance I attempt to give with my translation.

123. The bicolon is translated by Schmidt (1994: 88): 'Your witnesses are the gods. | Behold, humans are your witnesses'. The chiastic arrangement of the Ug. is to be noted, with its inversion of rank, location and status, for it has a bearing on the interpretation of the last term (*mtm*):

shades (*rpum*) : chthonian gods (*ilmym*) :: gods (*ilm*) : mortals (*mtm*)

The *Rpum* are higher in rank than mere mortals, but are below the chthonian gods in rank in the underworld. These are the categories of beings in the underworld, under the control of Shapsh by night as she passes through (*pace* Schmidt 1994: 84-88). By day, she is mistress over the gods (celestial powers) and mortals above. The last category, belonging with the gods to the upper realm (on and above the *arṣ*) cannot be the dead.

In the sea[124] of Arsh and the dragon[125],
Kothar-and-Hasis, steer (the bark)!
Pilot (the ship), Kothar-and-Hasis![126]

1.6 vi 54-58 Ilimilku[127] the Shubanite wrote (it), the student[128] of Attanu the diviner[129], chief of the priests, chief of the

124. This sea is the ambiguous cosmic ocean (Akk. *apsû*, Gk ἀβυσσος, Heb. *yam sûp*: Akk. *Ti'amat*, Ug. *thm*, Heb. *t'hôm*, etc.; cf. KTU 1.5 i 14-15 and n. 11) which both separates the land of the living from that of the dead, and also bounds all territories. For its more elaborate yet similar treatment in the biblical tradition see Wyatt (1996b: 81-105). The dragon sometimes dwells in the sea, and sometimes *is* the sea. See next note.

125. The identity of the dragon is not a serious problem: he is either an analogue or an avatar of Yam himself, the deified ocean. The identity of Arsh (*arš*) is however quite uncertain. See n. 50 at KTU 1.3 iii 43, where Anat claims to have smitten him.

126. The vbs are *yd*, *ytr*. This approach is offered by Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 270 and nn. n, o): 'navigate...voyage', Akk. *nadû*, 'throw', with the secondary sense 'put to sea'; or Heb. *nôd*, 'wander'; Heb. *tûr*, 'seek out, explore'. Cf. Gibson (1978: 81 n. 10). Wilfred Watson suggests to me that the latter vb may be better explained by ref. to Akk. *warûm*, yielding Gt 'to pilot ships'. Eusebius (*Praep. Ev.* 1.10.9) has Chousor (= Kothar, one ms. tradition reads Chrysor, 'Fire-worker') as the inventor of navigation, perhaps as a parallel to a similar Eg. tradition concerning Ptah? Cf. the Shabaka Stone (*ANET*, 5) which attributes to his creativity 'all work and all crafts'. An alternative approach might yield the following translation (as monocolon and bicolon):

In the sea are Arsh and the dragon:

Kothar-and-Hasis, drive (them) away!
Banish (them), Kothar-and-Hasis!

Kothar appears here to be given the task of driving off these enemies of Shapsh, as Seth drove off Apepi on the occasion of his nightly threat of Ra's subterranean bark. This interpretation is offered by the following: Driver (1956: 115): 'threw (into the sea)...cut (them) off'; Gibson (1978: 81): 'banish (them)...drive (them) away'; similarly del Olmo (1981a: 235), de Moor (1987: 99) and Pardee (1997c: 273 and n. 280). Cf. Akk. *nadû*, 'repel'.

127. For an estimate of Ilimilku see Sasson (1981: 91-92). On the rare phenomenon of an autograph, whether authorial or scribal, cf. *Atraḫasis* 3 viii end (Dalley 1991: 35).

128. Ug. *lmd*. 'Apprentice': Sasson (1981: 91).

129. Ug. *prln*, perhaps a transcription of Hur. *pu-ru-di-ni*, = Akk. *bârû*, a class of

temple herdsmen[130], sacrificer[131] of Niqmad[132] king of Ugarit, Lord of Yargub[133] and Ruler of Sharruman.[134]

priest. The titles following this designation belong to Attanu rather than to Ilimilku. Cf. Pardee (1997c: 273 n. 283).

130. Ug. *nqd*. For most recent discussion see Jeffers (1996: 111-16). She suggests that one of the duties of the *nqd* may have been hepatoscopy.

131. Ug. *ṯ'y*. See Aartun (1985: 46-47 §128, with references), Dietrich and Loretz (1987c), van Soldt (1988, 1989), Fleming (1991: 146-48), Freilich (1992) and del Olmo (1995: 41-42). What the relation is between this term and Keret's epithet *ṯ'* remains obscure. See n. 115 at KTU 1.14 iv 37 for further discussion and my proposal. 'An as yet uniquely attested ethnicon, applied to 'atn prln': Sasson (1981: 91).

132. The following kings of this name may be identified: (1) Niqmad I, son of Yaqaru (KTU 1.113.26 right), (2) Niqmad II (KTU 1.113.23 left: only the [ ]*d* survives); (3) Niqmad III (KTU 1.113.20, but only if the surviving letter is read as *d*; if it is *b*, this becomes Arḫalbu); (4) Niqmad IV (penultimate king of Ugarit; if the previous case falls, he is III). He does not feature in KTU 1.113, but is named at KTU 1.161.13. This still leaves the problem of the identity of the present king. Most have taken him to be Niqmad II. This is as good a label as any, though if there were four, he could conceivably be III. It is sad to reflect that he persists in the king list in the form of one surviving letter! But at least Ilimilku has made him the most interesting to the modern historian.

The king named at KTU 1.161.12 and 26 will be Niqmad II, or perhaps III if there were four. See nn. 9 and 11 at KTU 1.113 and n. 27 at KTU 1.161.12-13.

With the discovery of the Urtenu archive, Ilimilku is now known to have flourished in the time of Niqmad III or IV (my designation 'III-IV'). See Bordreuil and Malbran-Labat 1997 and Wyatt 2001b.

133. Or: 'formidable lord'. Cf. Del Olmo (1981: 562).

134. On the colophon and its meaning see especially van Soldt (1989). But cf. del Olmo (1992a: 117) on discerning here a fivefold titulary.

Part II
KTU 1.7–1.13

FRAGMENTS AND SHORTER MYTHS CONCERNING BAAL AND ANAT

KTU 1.7: Excerpts from KTU 1.3 concerning Anat

(KTU 1.7 = CTA 7 = UT 130, 131 = V AB variants A and B = RS 5.180 + 5.198)

Select Bibliography

Gordon 1949: 10, 27-28; Driver 1956: 118-19; Cassuto 1971: 175-83; del Olmo 1981a: 497-501.

KTU 1.7 is extremely fragmentary, consisting of two pieces constituting the upper right and lower left portions respectively of a text written without column-division on both sides; the original width and length of the whole tablet cannot be determined with complete certainty, making the estimate of missing numbers of letters hazardous.[1] Were it an isolated composition, no serious translation would be possible. However, the surviving text appears largely to duplicate parts of KTU 1.3 ii and iii, though in no coherent order, which allows tentative reconstruction, and the parallels are noted in the margin. (Cf. KTU 1.8 below.) See at the other locations for notes on the translation. Some of the restoration offered below is inevitably conjectural. The tablet is probably a scribal exercise, and the use of mythological material for such work, and the 'non-canonical' order of the text is eloquent testimony not only of the freedom with which the text was probably used, but of the existence of scribal schools apparently specializing in this genre of literature. This has implications for our understanding of the transmission of mythological tradition and also our estimate of the innovative role of Ilimilku in the larger texts.

1. Herdner (*CTA*, 44 n. 1) estimated line-length to be 25 to 30 signs. She also pointed out that extra line-length was available on the edges. Note also Cassuto's (1971: 178) diagrammatic reconstruction, in which a considerable lateral gap falls between the two fragments.

1.7 R 1 [ ]
[she attached palms to] her [gird]le; = 1.3 ii 12-3
She fixed he[ads to her back.] = 1.3 ii 11-12

[ ] she entered her house. cf. 1.3 ii 17

[And lo,] = 1.3 ii 5-6
[Anat fou]ght in the valley;
1.7 R 5 [she battled between the two towns.]

[She put tables] for armies, = 1.3 ii 22-27
s[tools for heroes.]

[Fiercely she fought and] looked;
[Anat] battled [and considered.]
[Her liver shook with laught]er;
her heart was filled [with joy],
[the liver of Anat with triumph.]

[Beneath her] like balls were heads.[2] = 1.3 ii 9

(her) knee<s> she steeped in the = 1.3 ii 13-14, 27-28
1.7 R 10 blood of [soldiers],

(gap of indeterminate length between two fragments)

[Vir]gin [Anat]
like a kid [ ]
1.7 R 15 The perfumes of [seven tamarisks,] = 1.3 ii 2-3
[the odour of coriander]
[and murex.]

and she me[t the divine assistants at the foot = 1.3 ii 4-5
of the mountain].

[Un]til she was sated [she fought in the house] = 1.3 ii 29
[ ]
[ ]
1.7 R 20 [Virgin Anat] washed [her] hands, = 1.3 ii 32-33[3]
Oil of [peace] was poured [into a bowl]. = 1.3 ii 31

[He took his lyre in his hand,] cf. 1.3 iii 4-8

2. *CTA* adds ['lh kirbym kp...]: ['above her like locusts were palms...'] = KTU 1.3 ii 10.

3. Or (l. 34): '[She] washed [her] hands [of the blood of warriors]'.

he clasped[4] the bull-shaped instrument
[to his breast,]

[singing of the loves of Valiant Baal,]
the [aff]ect[io]n[5] of Pidray [daughter of light,]
[the affection of Taliy daughter of Shower,]
[the love] of Arsiy daughter of Sn[atcher-for-ever].

1.7 R 25 '[And] speak to Virg[in Anat,] = 1.3 iii 11-29
lower [say to the Beloved of the Powerful One:]
edge ["Message of Valiant Baal,]
word of [Valiant Warrior]:

['Bury war in the earth;]
[set strife in] the dust:

[pour a communion-offering into the midst of the earth,]
[honey from a jar] into the midst of the st[eppe].

[Grasp your spear (and) your mace:]

[let your feet hast]en [towards me],
[let your legs] hu[rry to me]!

1.7 V 30 [For I have a word that I would say to you,]
a message that I would rep[eat to you]:

[a word of tree] and whisper of stone,

[the sighing of the heavens to the earth,]
[of the deep] to the stars,
[I understand the thunder which the heavens do not know.][6]

[Come,]
and I shall re[veal it]
[in the midst of my divine mountain, Saphon.'"']

He shall not stand[7] [ ]

1.7 V 35 the perfumes of seven tamarisk[s], = 1.3 ii 2-8
[the odour of coriander]
[and murex.]

4. Cf. discussion at KTU 1.3 iii 4 n. 36. Perhaps to be read *m'šṯ*?

5. Ug. [a]h[b]t (*KTU*[2]). In KTU 1.3 iii 6 the corresponding term is *yd*, which probably carries a more overtly sexual connotation.

6. As restored by *CTA*.

[Anat] close[d the doo]r[s of the house] = 1.3 ii 4-5
[and she met the divine assistants at the foot of the mountain.]

Then Anat fo[ught in the valley;]
[she battled between the two cities.]

She smote] the people of the sea-shore;
[she destroyed the men of the sunrise.]

...

(a further ten lines missing, not including the gap of uncertain length between fragments: almost entire reverse of RS 5.180 now eroded)

KTU 1.8: Excerpts from KTU 1.4

(KTU 1.8 = CTA 8 = UT 51 fragment = II AB Variant = RS 3.364)

Select Bibliography
Del Olmo 1981: 497-501; M.S. Smith in Parker 1997: 179-80.

This text, like KTU 1.7, also consists of short excerpts or paraphrases from other passages, as indicated. See at other locations for notes on the translation. One column (ii or v) remains of a six-column tablet.[1] Perhaps a scribal exercise?

1.8	ii	1	'Where is the gift for the Lady-who-tramples-[S]ea, the present for the Mother of the gods?'	= 1.4 i 20-22
			'And there is no house for Baal like the gods, nor dwelling like the sons of Athirat.'	= 1.4 iv 50-51[2]
1.8	ii	5	Aloud to his divine assistants Baal cries: 'Look, Gupan and Ugar, the Dark One has obscured the day, the Gloomy One the Exalted Sovereign. ...'	= 1.4 vii 52-59

1. *KTU*^{2}, 30 col. 1 n. 1.

2. I suppose that KTU 1.4 iv 50-51 is the direct source for the present text, since the surrounding sections are also drawn from tablet 4. The text is similar to other passages, such as KTU 1.3 iv 46-48, v 3-4, v 38, 1.4 [i 9-11], iv 62–v 1, v 27-29. At first glance it is a hybrid, but it is preferable to read an error in the first signs. Here are the main forms for comparison:

KTU 1.3 v 3-4	*lytn bt lb'l kilm* [*whẓ*]*r kbn aṯrt*
KTU 1.3 v 38-39	*wn in bt lb'l kilm whẓr kb*[*n*] *aṯrt*
KTU 1.4 iv 50-51	*wn in bt lb'l kilm whẓr kbn aṯrt*
KTU 1.8 ii 3-4	*w tn bt lb'l kilm whẓr kbn aṯrt*

This comparison suggests that the present text be read *wn*[!] *i*[!]*n bt lb'l*...where perhaps the student began the *n* of *wn*, but moved on too quickly, after making only its first stroke. If he had been copying out various sections of the Baal-myths, variants such as this may have caused some confusion. I have translated accordingly.

KTU 1.9: A Fragment of a Myth concerning Baal or his Son

(KTU 1.9 = CTA 9 = UT 133 = RS 5.229)

Select Bibliography

Gordon 1949: 10, 15; Astour 1967: 200-201; del Olmo 1981a: 497-502.

Apparently a further scribal exercise. It is not certain which side should be read first, but the non-continuation of the text on the surviving lower edge suggests that the main surviving group of lines constitutes the verso. The width is indeterminate. This text does not correspond to any other known material from Ugarit. We have nothing with which to compare the fragment directly, though Astour attempts to link it with the Gk Dionysus-Zagreus myths. But it is possible that the myth deals with the son born to Baal in KTU 1.10 iii 34-35, where he is called 'bull' (*ibr*: cf. l. 11 below). Note also the reference to the bow in l. 13, and cf. KTU 1.10 ii 6. These allusions suggest a thematic link with KTU 1.10. Parts of the translation are entirely conjectural.

upper edge [Belonging to? Ab]dil[1].

1.9 R 1 (seven surviving lines, but only a few signs in each)

1.9 V 8 ...[ ]
he raised him up [ ]
1.9 V 10 the king of ? his hill which [ ]
the bull of all of them who had no [ ]
Let him indeed[2] be given to them instead of Baal,
[ ]
or a bow before Hadd in [his] ha[nd?]
...[3] on the day[4] (when) Baal puts (him) to the test[5],

1. This is a PN (cf. Heb. Abdiel). It presumably identifies the student scribe who wrote the tablet.
2. Ug. *l*. Or: 'not'.
3. Text '*m*. It is hard to construe this as 'to', with the following *b*. Is it the end of a word, such as [*šb*]'*m*, 'seventy'?
4. Ug. *bym*. Or: 'against Yam'. Astour (1967: 201): 'in the sea...'.
5. Ug. *ysy*. Cf. Heb. *nāsâ*.

		he[6] [ ]
1.9 V	15	The wicked ones arose,
		the worthless[7] [ones]
		Nahar king[8]...[9] [ ]
		Prince Baal [ ] an heir[10] [ ]
		a youngster[11] of Hadd and [ ]
		and to Nahar[12] he went [ ]

6. Ug. *ym*[ ]. I have construed as the beginning of a yqtl vb, such as *ym*[*ḥṣ*] or *ym*[*lk*]. Or: 'Yam...'.

7. Ug. *mzl*[ ]. To be distinguished on the basis of context from √*mzl*, 'run' (KTU 1.14 ii 46-47 and n. 72). Astour (1967: 201 and n. 2): 'the evil[doers]', 'or: "the dest[royers]"'. Cf. Heb. *zālal*, hiph. 'despise'.

8. Ug. *mlk nhr*. Or: 'Nahar rules'? In the main body of the Baal-Yam myth (starting at KTU 1.2 iii 16) Yam is called *ṯpṭ nhr*, 'Ruler Nahar'.

9. Three signs survive. *KTU*[2] reads *ibr* (with a fourth sign rendered ×), but the *i* does not resemble the other *i* on the tablet (*ibr* l. 11). It looks more like a *z* (but this is impossible) or conceivably a badly-written *g* (*gbr*: 'warrior').

10. Ug. *ǵlm*. The word is difficult to translate with precision, and needs to be adjusted to the context. See n. 99 at KTU 1.2 i 13. If it be taken as 'divine assistant', it would refer to someone other than Baal. The conventional translation 'lad' could however fit Baal or his son, being perhaps parallel to *ṣǵr* in l. 18.

11. Rather than 'Hadd was young'.

12. Or: 'to the river' (Astour 1967: 201).

KTU 1.10: Baal, the Heifer, and Anat

(KTU 1.10 = CTA 10 = UT 76 = IV AB = RS 3.362 + 5.181)

Select Bibliography

Virolleaud 1936a; Caquot and Sznycer 1974: 273-89; de Moor 1987: 110-16; P.L. Day 1991, 1992a; Walls 1992: 131-34; Lloyd 1994: 259-68; M.S. Smith in Parker 1997: 181-86.

The tablet has three columns of text on one side only. The first column does not yield much information. When the text becomes sufficiently coherent for sense to be made it appears that Baal goes hunting in the Shamak Marsh (Lake Hule?), and Anat follows him there. On seeing a cow (impregnated by Baal?) giving birth, the goddess is evidently filled with passion, and she and Baal make love. He then repairs to his mountain, where Anat later announces to him the birth of his son. (This is the gist of the text as I read it, but it must be admitted that the precise relationship between Anat and the cow is not certain, and P.L. Day and Walls are dubious about Anat's sexual involvement.)

1.10 i (About 20 lines missing)

1.10 i 1 [ ] Virgin Anat
[ ]
[ ] which the sons of El do not know[1]
[ ] the assembly of the stars,
1.10 i 5 [ ] the generation(s) of heaven...
[V]aliant Baal
[ ] the Charioteer of the Clouds
[ ] peoples
[ ] would dwell in[2] the earth
1.10 i 10 [ ] the dead[3]
[ ]
[ ]

1. Or: 'do indeed know'.
2. The alternative proposed by de Moor (1987: 111) 'would return to the earth' is also possible. (Ug. *ytb* corresponds to both Heb. *šwb* and *yšb*.)
3. Or: 'men'.

[ ]
[Virgin] Anat
1.10 i 15 [Beloved of] the Powerful One
[ ] peoples,
[would dwel]l in the earth...

(10 further lines with a decreasing number of characters, followed by gap of about 13 lines)

1.10 ii (gap of some 20 lines)

'...
1.10 ii 1 [Is Baal in his house,]
[Divine Hadd with]in his palace?'

And the divine messengers of Baal replied:
'Baal is not in his house,
1.10 ii 5 (nor) Divine Hadd within his palace.

His bow he took in his (left) hand,
and his arrows in his right hand,

Then indeed he set his face
towards the shores of Shamak[4], filled with wild oxen.'
1.10 ii 10 Virgin Anat spread her wings,
she spread her wings
and winged her way[5]
towards the shores of Shamak, filled with wild oxen.

And Valiant Baal lifted up his eyes,
he lifted up his eyes and saw,
1.10 ii 15 yes, he saw Virgin Anat,
the loveliest among the sisters of Baal.

4. Perhaps Lake Hule, according to Lipiński (1971a: 16-17), followed by de Moor (1987: 112 n. 18). Margalit (1989b: 75, 77) identifies it with Josephus' Semachonitis (= Hule: *Ant.* v 1 etc.: G.A. Smith 1931: 480) and also locates the marsh of KTU 1.92 here.

5. Lit. 'she turned on the wing', or 'she set out on the wing'. On the problem of how *tr* is to be construed see Walls (1992: 133) and Lloyd (1994: 260 n. 2). I follow the latter, who takes it as inf. of *tr*, Heb. *tûr*, Akk. *târu* (Virolleaud 1936a: 162; Caquot and Sznycer 1974: 283 n. m.).

To her he hurried and stood.
at her feet he bowed and fell down.

He lifted up his voice and cried,
1.10 ii 20 'Life, sister, and longevity[6] be yours!

The horns of your power[7], Virgin Anat,
the horns of your power let Baal anoint,
let Baal anoint them against weariness[8].

Let us plant in the earth my foes,
1.10 ii 25 and in the earth those who arise against your brother!'

And Virgin Anat lifted up her eyes,
and lifted up her eyes and saw,
and saw a cow.

And it was turning round as it went,
it was turning round as it went,
and was turning round in its pangs[9].

1.10 ii 30 [In] the grace, the beauty[10] of the band of the Kotharat[?11]

6. Ug. *wnark*. N form of *ark* 'to be long': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 284 n. n) and Gordon (*UT*, 366 [§19.354]; 1977: 120). De Moor (1987: 113): 'let us shine upon you' (*ar*: 'shine', 1st pl. with f. sg. suff.)

7. Virolleaud (1936a: 160) and del Olmo (1981a: 470, 535): *dbat* 'power' (Heb. *dōbē*). 'Headdress' de Moor (1987: 113). 'Horns with which you strike': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 284 n. o: Ar. *daba'a*, 'strike with a stick', Akk. *da'āp/bu* 'crush an enemy').

8. Thus Watson (1977a: 277), followed by Lloyd (1994: 261). (Ug. *'p*; cf. Heb. *'w/yp*, 'be weary'.) Del Olmo (1981: 470): 'Baal will anoint them with (the power of) flight'; de Moor (1987: 113): 'Ba'lu will anoint them while flying'.

9. I interpret *tr* as narrative inf. as in l. 11 above ('she winged...'). The cow is the subject. It is evidently in the throes of labour-pains, turning this way and that. Cf. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 285, where it is not clear if the cow or Anat is in labour) and Lloyd (1994: 262 and n. 8). For Gordon (1977: 120) it is apparently Anat, who is dancing, while de Moor (1987: 13) has 'Anat saw a cow and started to flow... to convulse', understanding Anat to be overcome with passion. The use of the same vb in three successive cola reads awkwardly at first glance. Perhaps the second colon should be excised as a dittograph. But a better explanation may be that it is rhetorical, a form of frequentative, in which the restlessness and anguish of the animal in labour is expressed. The same formula *tlk wtr* occurs in col. iii 17 below.

10. Cf. the same epithets used of the end of the world in KTU 1.5 vi 6-7, translated as 'Paradise', 'Delight'.

11. *KTU*^{2}, 32 ends the line ḫbl.kṯr (with only the final *r* in italics as certain!).

[(Her) voice[12]] Anat addressed to Baal:

'[ ] O Baal of the mist[13],
[Divine] Hadd of the clouds...
[ ] Valiant Baa[l]
[Virgi]n Anat...

(fragmentary 5 lines)

1.10 iii (gap of some 20 lines)

'...

1.10 iii 1 [ ] the cows[14] gave birth [ ]
a bull for Virgin Anat
and a heifer for the Beloved of the Powerful One!'

And Valiant [Baal] said:

1.10 iii 5 'Indeed, like our progenitor [I shall] mount [you,[15]]
as the Ageless One[16] who begot [us!']

Baal advanced, [his penis] tumescent;
Divine Hadd, [his] pha[llus] erect[17].

Del Olmo (1981a: 470) and Lloyd (1994: 262) both read and interpret as above, but with each sign heavily qualified as tentative. Walls (1992: 131) reads *ḥ*[ ]kǵrt, but does not translate. Virolleaud (1936a: 153): [ ]*k*(?) *ǵ* (?)*r*; *CTA*: *ḥ*[—]kǵrt: 'very uncertain reading'. Any reading is conjectural, but may be tentatively restored by comparison with KTU 1.11.6.

12. Restored from formulaic use in col. iii 33.

13. Following Gibson's suggestion (1978: 142) taken up by Walls (1992: 131) and Lloyd (1994: 262), that *iph* is related to Akk. *upû*, 'mist, cloud'. Perhaps read **ipi* (gen.)? Similarly de Moor (1987: 113) 'drizzle'. Del Olmo (1981: 470) 'whom I have seen' (√*ph*).

14. Text *arḫt* (apparently pl.). We would expect one cow, or possibly two, one giving birth to each of the offspring of the next two cola. (In this case we would have a variation on the widespread gemination motif: see Wyatt 1996b: 219-59.)

15. Following Lloyd (1994: 263). Cf. Virolleaud (1936a: 167): imperative: 'mount'. Caquot (1974: 286): 'like our eternal (*'lm*) creator', followed by Gordon (1977: 120), de Moor (1987: 114) and Walls (1992: 132). The context speaks in favour of the first alternative.

16. Correct *drd* to *dr* or *drdr*. See M.S. Smith (2001: 136).

17. Text [ ]...*uṣ*[ ]. 'Penis' || 'phallus': *yd* || *uṣb't* (lit. 'hand || finger' [or plural]: restored after Ginsberg [1969: 142], though he interprets differently). For Heb. usage cf. Delcor (1967) and Wyatt (1994: 416). 'Tumescent...erect' (*mli*,

Moist[18] was the nethermouth[19] of Virgin Anat,
1.10 iii 10 and the nethermouth of the most gracious of Ba[al's]
sisters.

Baal went up onto the moun[tain ,]
and the son of Dagan into the he[avens[720]]

Baal sat on the thro[ne of his kingship,]
the son of Dagan on the sie[ge of his dominion.]

1.10 iii 15 To the bull...called [ ]
to the bu<ll>...cried out[21] [ ]

She went and turned[22] [ ]
[in] the grace, the bea[uty[23] of the band of the Kotharat].

A cow, a cow[24]...[ ]

1.10 iii 20 a bull she bore [to Baal]
and a wild ox [to the Charioteer of the Clouds.]

The c[ow] embraced[25] [ ]
The [cow] embraced [ ]
and covered him with...[ ]

1.10 iii 25 [ ] his navel[26] and his first milk
[ ] his infant milk.[27]

By the slope she went up onto the mountain,

mla), lit. 'full', but different vocalizations inviting different nuances. Ug. also uses √*ark* (KTU 1.23.33 and parallels).

18. 'Moist', interpreting *blt* of text in the light as √*bll*, cf. Akk. *balâlu*, Ar. *ball*. Cf. Heb. *bll*. Text has *t* overwritten on *l*, so many read as *btlt*.

19. Text *p*: 'mouth'. Interpreted as 'vagina' by de Moor (1987: 114: 'orifice') and Lloyd (1994: 264 n. 21, *contra* Walls).

20. Text *bš* [ ]. Ginsberg (1969: 142) *bš* [*mm*].

21. Text *ql.nd*...Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 287 n. z) compare Akk. *nadû rigma*, 'utter a word'.

22. The birth is again imminent. See at ll. ii 28-29 above.

23. Cf. the same epithets used of the end of the world in KTU 1.5 vi 6-7, translated as 'Paradise', 'Delight'.

24. Dittography?

25. Or: 'she embraced the cow'.

26. Perhaps this represents the cow severing the calf's umbilical cord? Or: 'her navel' (metonymy for 'udder'?); or: 'her vulva'? Cf. *šōr* = 'vulva' in Song 7:3 (Pope 1977a: 617).

27. Lit. 'the first milk of his infancy'.

by the pathway[28] onto the mountain[29] of victory,

and she went up thence[30] onto Arur,

1.10 iii 30 and[31] from Arur up to Saphon,
into Paradise[32] on the mountain of victory.

Her voice to Baal she addressed:

'Hear the greatest[33] good ne[ws, B]aal,
hear the news, Scion of Dagan[34],

1.10 iii 35 for a bull is born to Baal,
and a wild ox to the Charioteer of the Clouds!'

Valiant Baal rejoiced.

28. 'Slope...pathway', lit. 'flank...stairway' (*yrk...mšlmt*). Cf. Heb. *yarkᵉtê ṣāpôn* in Isa. 14.14 (corresponding to Ug. *bṣrrt ṣpn*); Heb. *sullām*, 'stairway' (Gen. 28.12). Cf. del Olmo (1981a: 473): 'slope...hill'; de Moor (1987: 115): 'spur... stairs'.

29. Ug. *ǵr tliyt*. This form is used here and at KTU 1.101.3. At KTU 1.3 iii 31 the expression *gb' tliyt* is used. Cf. the similar variation between *mrym ṣpn* and *ṣrrt ṣpn*.

30. Text reads *bkm* after *t'l* ('she went'). Aartun (1967: 288-89): *b* + *km* (cf. Ar. *kīm*, 'hill', followed by Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 288 n. f) and Renfroe (1992: 57-59). Del Olmo (1981: 526) reads it as a conj. (= Heb. *bᵉkēn*), also discussed by Aartun. Thus de Moor (1987: 115). Gordon (1977: 120): 'weeping' (√*bky*).

31. The 'and' follows 'Arur' in the text.

32. Ug. *n'm*. Lit. 'beautiful place'. Cf. the location of Eden on a sacred mountain in Ezek. 28.13-14. Cf. also at KTU 1.5 vi 6, 28.

33. The *il* is superlative.

34. I am here giving the sense usually understood. Contrast Wyatt (1992a: 415-16 §14).

KTU 1.11: A Fragment concerning Baal and Anat

(KTU 1.11 = CTA 11 = UT 132 = RS 3.319)

Select Bibliography

Virolleaud 1944–45b; Caquot and Sznycer 1974: 289; de Moor 1987: 116; Walls 1992: 134-39; Lloyd 1994: 268-73; M.S. Smith in Parker 1997: 186-87.

Various scholars think that this text is the top of KTU 1. 10 iii above.

1.11 1 [Baa]l was aroused[1] and grasped her by the belly[2];
[Anat][3] was aroused and grasped him by the penis[4].

[Baa]l...to[5] the bull
[Vir]gin Anat...

'[Embra]ce, conceive and give birth,
[in the grace, the beaut]y of the band of the Kotharat[6].'

[Vir]gin Anat
[Val]iant Baal...

1. For discussion of the obscure verb *yṯkḥ* see Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 239-40 n. f). Cf. Rin (1968: 23-24) on Isa. 23.16. See n. 7 at KTU 1.5 i 4.

2. 'Abdomen', as euphemism for 'vagina': de Moor (1987: 116 n. 1). 'Womb': cf. Gen. 25.22 (Lloyd 1994: 269 n. 39): Akk. *qerbītu*, 'womb'.

3. The restoration of Anat here is based on the context: only she and Baal appear in this fragment.

4. Read *ušr* for *ušk*: edge of tablet friable. Cf. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 289 n. l) and Watson (1977a: 277).

5. Ug. *l*. Or 'for', or 'from'.

6. Formula conjecturally restored by comparison with KTU 1.10 ii 30.

KTU 1.12: The Devourers

(KTU 1.12 = CTA 12 = UT 75 = BH = RS 2.[012])

Select Bibliography

Virolleaud 1935b; Dussaud 1936; Ginsberg 1936a; Gaster 1937, 1950: 217-22, 450-51; Gray 1951; Kapelrud 1969; Gray 1971; Caquot 1974: 333-51; Wyatt 1976, 1996b: 220-31; Gordon 1977: 121-25; de Moor 1987: 128-34; Parker 1997: 188-91.

The first part of this text is a theogony, evidently from a common source as KTU 1.23, though now sharply divergent. On the common ground see Wyatt (1996b: 220-31 and refs). The second, fragmentary part describes Baal's death and the 'cosmic mourning'[1] which follows. An atonement element appears to be present (see especially l. 46 of col. ii), and the text ends with a ritual instruction.

1.12 i (about 6 lines missing)

'[you make] us pregnant with Shahar,
[you make] us pregnant with Qadmu[2]!
Our entrails[3], El our father,
1.12 i 10 our entrails like fire they are eating,
our vitals[4] like worms[5] they are devouring!'

1. This is not to be treated simply as a doublet of KTU 1.5, where the death is not actually described (perhaps part of the missing text), but is alluded to in a number of ways, as with its announcement and El's response at KTU 1.5 vi 8-25. Nor is the drying up of the world in mourning (ii 42-43) to be interpreted in a 'seasonal' fashion, any more than such descriptions elsewhere.

2. 'Shahar... Qadmu' (divine names) tentatively, following de Moor (1987: 129). 'Dawn... east', Ginsberg (1936a: 140), Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 334) and Gordon (1977: 122). '—... cast wind', Gaster (1950: 219). *k*...*k*..., taken as *kaph veritatis*.

3. Lit. 'liver'.

4. Lit. 'breasts', but this is an internal devouring by ravenous foetuses.

5. 'Fire... worms': Ug. *iš*, Heb. *'ēš*, Ug. *mrm*, cf. Heb. *rimmâ*. 'Fire... corruption': Gray (1951: 148; but 'worms', 1971: 62); 'fire...—': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 334). Other suggestions: 'mole... ferret(?)': Ginsberg (1936a: 140); 'mole... worm': Gaster (1950: 219); 'fire... fatted calves'(!): Kapelrud, (1969: 320); 'a (liver-) fluke... worms': Wyatt (1976: 416); 'curs... puppies': del Olmo

El laughed in his heart
and convulsed with laughter in his liver.

'Go out, you, O Talish handmaid of Yarih!
O Dimgay handmaid of Athirat!

Take your birthing stool,
your litter, your swaddling-clothes,

and go out from the tree in the centre[6]
towards the vast and awful desert.[7]

Dig with your elbows in the dust,
your nails[8] in the soil!

Go into labour
and bring forth the eaters;
let them bring you to your knees,
and give birth to the devourers.'

El pronounced their names.

'May they have horns like bulls,
and humps like steers!'[9]

(1981a: 481).

6. 'Tree': Ug. *aln* (Heb. *'allôn, 'ēlôn, 'ēlâ*); Driver (1956: 71): 'oak'; del Olmo (1981a: 482): 'holm-oak'. I take *tk*, 'towards', or 'within' (cf. Hebrew *tôk*) with adverbial ending *m*, relating to the cultic tree at the centre of the world, contrasting the centre with the limen of the desert.

7. I have taken *šiy* to be an adjectival form from √*š 'y* (Hebrew *š 'h*) 'fall into ruins'. If the words *il* (here taken as superlative) and *šiy* were to be joined (word-dividers are used sporadically in this text), *ilšiy* could be Alashia (Cyprus), 'Cypriot' being the equivalent of 'maritime'. In KTU 1.23 the events take place at the edge of the cosmic ocean, the *t'hôm* of the biblical tradition. Many scholars leave *tkm* and *ilšiy* untranslated. See discussion in Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 338-39, nn. z-c). 'Desert', *mlbr* for *mdbr*.

8. Lit. 'the bones of the hand'. Cf. the Akk. term *šinqatu*, 'finger nail' (lit. tooth of the hand'): *CAD*, XVII [Š/3], 54a.

9. A blessing pronounced by El. The bull-like devourers—this is a simile—are perhaps goats (Wyatt 1996b: 239). Kapelrud (1969) identifies them as locusts. De Moor (1981–82: 113-14) seems to think that they are flies. A bovine simile for insects appears implausible. Besides, they are not to be regarded as demons (such as the *dbbm* of KTU 1.169.1, whom de Moor also takes to be flies) because their birth from Athirat and their analogy with the twin deities of KTU 1.23 are too powerful a motif to relegate to the sidelines of theology.

And Baal's face was on them[10].
Baal went out hunting
1.12 i 35 and came to the edge of the desert.
And now[11] he found the eaters,
and he came upon the devourers.
Baal greatly desired to have them,
the Son of Dagan was eager for them[12].
1.12 i 40 Baal approached them on foot,
and divine Hadd on tip-toe[13].

1.12 ii (first 3 lines only odd letters)

...face...[ ]
1.12 ii 5 Baal [ ]
divine Hadd [ ][14]

(ll. 7-20 only odd letters)

Baal [ ]
divine Hadd [ ]

10. That is, Baal shows an interest in them. Similarly Gaster (1950: 219). Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 341 n. o), takes the preposition *b* to mean 'against', in a hostile sense. Others postulate that the Devourers look like Baal: thus Ginsberg (1936a: 144 n. 15a), apparently Gray (1951: 149—unclear), del Olmo (1981a: 482) and de Moor (1987: 131).

11. Ug. *wn*. On the problems of the precise analysis of this term see Watson (1994c).

12. It is unclear what Baal's motivation is. Sex? Hunger? The thrill of the hunt? Physical prowess? Perhaps a number of these is combined. Cf. KTU 1.18 iv 3-4, 1.93.

13. 'On foot...tiptoe' (*p'n...ḫrṣ'*), following de Moor (1987: 131), acknowledging that the second term is explained contextually. Similarly Ginsberg (1936a: 145) and Del Olmo (1981a: 483). Gray (1951: 149 n. 139) corrects second term to *ḫrṣ*, which he translates as 'haste'. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 343 n. w) take this up, explain it by reference to Ar. *ḫarîḍ*, 'serrated tooth of lion', and translate 'club...pike'(!). Dussaud (1936: 12-13): 'foot...axe', which ignores the parallelism.

14. De Moor (1987: 131) restores this bicolon and that in ii 21-22 on basis of i 40-41 above.

(ll. 23-24 only initial letters)

1.12 ii 25 ...the Son of Dagan [ ]

(ll. 26-28 give no sense)

...[15] noble...[ ]
1.12 ii 30 ...terrible[16]...[ ]
Baal's eyes[17] the [ ] seized [ ]
his back they seized,
[his] bo[w they seized]
Baal's feet the [ ] seized.
and the...s[18] destroyed [Baal?,]
1.12 ii 35 the eaters seized [ ][19].
[Baal][20] fell into a swamp[21] [ ]
His nostrils[22] grew feverish [ ]
in his loins he became hot [ ]

15. Ll. 29-30 both begin *idm*...This probably means 'red' (cf. de Moor 1987: 132, 'red drink'). The colour red is associated with vitality and power. Cf. KTU 1.14 ii 9 and n. 44.

16. Ug. *'rẓ*: Del Olmo (1981: 605), cites this instance as of unknown meaning; the epithet *'rẓ* used of Athtar in KTU 1.6 i 55 etc. is commonly interpreted as 'terrible', a suitable parallel for 'noble'. De Moor (1987: 132 and n. 29) interprets as 'rich' here and of Athtar. Cf. n. 72 at KTU 1.6 i 48.

17. Ug. *'n.b'l*: Ginsberg (1936a: 147): 'Baal's eyes' (also Gaster 1950: 221; del Olmo 1981a: 484); Gray (1951: 149): 'Ba'al declared'; Caquot (1974: 346): 'Baal saw'; de Moor (1987: 132): 'Look! Ba'lu...'.

18. Ug. *ǵllm* usually explained by reference to Ar. *ǵalīl*, Virolleaud (1935b: 261); thus Caquot (1974: 346); de Moor (1987: 132): 'thirsters' (Ar. *ǵal'il*). But see Renfroe (1992: 107). Driver (1956: 73, 142 n. 33): 'fetters' (Heb. *'ōl*, Ar. *ǵullu*, 'manacles').

19. I have taken all the verbs here as 3 pl. qatal form, with Baal's adversaries as the subject. This is in view of the sequel. Alternatively, Baal is the subject. Del Olmo (1981: 484) has various emotions seize Baal.

20. Baal's adversaries may alternatively be the subject of this series of verbs.

21. Ug. *mšmš*. Gaster (1950: 450) cites 'Ar. *mšš*, "ooze" and derived nouns meaning "swampy ground"'. Thus Gray (1951: 65: 'swamp'; 1971: 65: 'mire'); del Olmo (1981a: 484, 584). Virolleaud (1935b: 261-62), without translating, cites the analogy of Ar. *masnās*, 'confused matter'; Ginsberg (1936a: 147): 'groping darkness' (Heb., Aram. *mšmš*, 'feel, grope'). Cf. Renfroe (1992: 132-33).

22. Thus Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 347), del Olmo (1981a: 484): Ug. *anpnm*, (probably dual? cf. Ar. *anfu*) and de Moor (1987: 133). Ginsberg (1936a: 147): 'countenance'; similarly Gray (1951: 149), but this is rather *ap*.

his temples[23] [burned?] as though with malaria[24];

1.12 ii 40 he was as one in a fever [ ]
...[25] [ ]

The ea[rth] dried up entirely[26] [?]
The watercourses of the steppe[27] became parch[ed]

Seven years El filled[28] [the fields?]
1.12 ii 45 and eight anniversaries[29] [ ]

for he was clothed[30] as in a garment in the blood of his br[others,]
as with a robe in the blood[31] of his kinsmen,

23. Or: 'his horns' (*qrnh*: cf. Exod. 34.29-35!).

24. Text *ǵb*[ ]. Following Driver's suggestion (1956: 143 n. 11): Ar. *ǵibbu*, 'tertiary fever'. Thus del Olmo (1981a: 484).

25. None of the proposals for this line is convincing. Cf. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 348 n. m).

26. Following Driver (1956: 73, 153 n. 11) and del Olmo (1981a: 484, 639): Aram. *tera'*, Ar. *tari'a*); cf. Gray (1971: 65).

27. Ug. *bnt šdm*: lit. 'daughters of the steppe', accepting Virolleaud's proposal (1935b: 262 and n. 1, cf. Ar. *banâtu larḍi*, 'daughters of the land', 'wadis'). Thus also Driver (1956: 73 n. 4), Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 348) and del Olmo (1981a: 484). Kapelrud (1969: 327): 'I must restore' (√*bny*). Gaster (1950: 221): '...daughters; fields...'. Ginsberg (1936a: 147): 'there mourned(?) the earth...', adding *a*, ending previous line to produce *abnt*, ignoring missing signs, and insisting (n. 38) that *šdm* stands for *šdmt* (on which see Wyatt 1992c). De Moor (1987: 133): 'the growth on the fields...'.

28. Ug. *mla*. Or: 'was full'; or: 'made fruitful [the fields]' (Wyatt [1976: 418]: referring to seven years of plenty?). Cf. Gordon (1977: 124): 'is abundant'. 'El': de Moor (1987: 133): 'the god' (n. 37: 'probably Ba'lu...').

29. Ug. *wṯmn.nqpnt*. Lit. 'eight cycles of time' (*WUS*, 213 §1847; del Olmo 1981a: 593; *UT*, 447 §19.1700). Cf. Heb. *nāqap*. Or: 'but the eighth was dried up until [ ]' (Wyatt 1976: 418), reading **nqpat* for *nqpnt*. Cf. √*qāpâ* in Exod. 15.8. See also formula at KTU 1.23.66-67 (...*nqpt*...). De Moor (1971: 57 n. 26) interprets *nqpt* as 'equinox'. But this does not seem appropriate here.

30. Narrative inf. (*UT*, 80 §9.29), taken as 3 m. sg. pass. or intrans. in force by Gray (1951: 150; 1971: 66), Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 348), Gordon (1977: 124) and del Olmo (1981a: 485); as 3 m. pl. by Gaster (1950: 221), Driver (1956: 73) and de Moor (1987: 133); as 3 m. sg. active by Ginsberg (1936a: 148).

31. 'Garment...blood', 'robe...blood': Ug. *dm* (Heb. *dām*), 'blood'. De Moor (1987: 133), 'mourning dress...mourning coat': Ug. *dm* (Heb. *dāmam*), 'weep'.

As seven were f[illed[32]] for his seventy brothers,
and eight for the eighty[33],
1.12 ii 50 the chief of his brothers found him,
and find him did the chief of his companions.
At the most dangerous moment,
at the most crucial time[34],
thus Baal had fallen like a bull,
1.12 ii 55 and Hadd had been prostrated[35] like a steer
in the midst of the swamp of [ ].
...[36]
...
Let the king pour out a jug[37]
let him pour water drawn from the well,

32. Restoring *ym*[*lu*]: cf. l. 44, *mla*. The subject is presumably the years of l. 44. Or, if a ritual context is presupposed, perhaps *ym*[*m*]: 'days'. *KTU*[2]: ym[ġyh].

33. 'Seven...seventy...eight...eighty': thus Ginsberg (1936a: 148), Gray (1951: 150; 1971: 66) and Kapelrud (1969: 327). 'Seventy-seven...eighty-eight'—so Gaster (1950: 221), Driver (1956: 73), Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 349), Gordon (1977: 124), del Olmo (1981a: 485) and de Moor (1987: 134)—is impossible, because of the *l* before *šb'm* and *ṯmnym*.

34. Lit. 'danger of dangers...crisis of crises' (Ug. *skn*, Heb. *skn* II, Ug. *'dn*, Akk. *edinnu*), 'crisis in illness': Landsberger (1949: 257) and Gray (1951: 150 n. 57; 1971: 66 n. 48). Similarly Gaster (1950: 222), Kapelrud (1969: 328) and de Moor (1987: 134: cf. Akk. *šikin adanni*). Other views: Driver (1956: 73): 'utmost care...utmost delight' (Ug. √*skn* I, *'dn*, Heb. *'ēden*, 'delight'); Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 349 and nn. t, u): 'with the best offerings, with the most delicious things' (√*skn*, 'to place', Ug. *'dn*, Heb. *'ēden*); del Olmo (1981a: 485, 595): 'before the most distinguished leaders...before the elite troop' (Ug. *skn* III, Heb. *sōkēn*, Akk. *saknu*, 'leader').

35. Ug. *tkms*: cf. Akk. *kamāsu*, 'kneel, prostrate oneself'.

36. The verb beginning this line was first read as *ittpq*; now read as *i*<*š*>*ttk* as in following line: *KTU*[1 and 2], del Olmo (1981a: 485). The same root appears to be used in the following lines. The two main lines of interpretation are to see √*ntk*, 'to pour': Gray (1951: 150), Kapelrud (1969: 328) and de Moor (1987: 134), which I think is contextually more probable; or √*štk* (cf. Heb. *štq*, Ar. *škt*), 'to cease': Ginsberg (1936a: 148), Gaster (1950: 222), Driver (1956: 73), Gray (1971: 67) and del Olmo (1981a: 485-86). Gaster (1937: 48 n. 61) had explained the verb by reference to Syr. *šky* and translated 'pay heed'. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 350 n. c) understand √*šyt*, 'to place'. Similarly Gordon (1977: 125) and Gray (1951: 150 for l. 57).

37. Ug. *dn* II (cf. Akk. *dannu*), 'jug'. Or: 'justice' (*dn* I, cf. Heb. √*dyn*). Amos 5.24 uses a water metaphor for justice.

1.12 ii 60 let him pour from the well in El's temple[38]
and from the deep in the temple of the Craftsman[39].

38. Or 'the god's temple', the god being Kothar, the 'craftsman' of the following colon. I have translated *hkl* (Sum. E.GAL, Akk. *ekallu*, 'great house') as 'palace' throughout the Baal texts, because the emphasis there is surely on royal ideology and the importance of having a 'house' (an important theme in the Keret story too [see introduction to KTU 1.14-16 and cf. Merrill 1968]). See n. 66 to KTU 1.2 iii 7. With Anat's house at KTU 1.3 ii 18 (see n. 29) I have followed the same convention. The present passage is concerned more directly with cultic matters, so 'temple' is the more appropriate translation.

39. All translations of the last four lines differ greatly. It seems that a water ritual performed by the king is to be understood. To the *mṣlt*, see Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 351 n. g), and de Moor (1987: 134), and cf. the Jerusalem temple 'sea' (sc. reservoir of water for ritual purposes) in 1 Kgs 7.23-26, corresponding to sacred pools in Egyptian temples.

KTU 1.13: A Hymn to Anat

(*KTU* 1.13 = *CTA* 13 = *UT* 6 = RS. 1.006)

Select Bibliography
Cazelles 1956; de Moor 1980a, 1987: 137-41; del Olmo 1981a: 487-94, 1981b; Caquot 1989: 19-27; Walls 1992: 138-44; Lloyd 1994: 273-88; Margalit 1995: 231-38.

This hymnic text shows the complex character of the goddess, destructive from birth, and herself at the end giving birth, without having conceived. A series of horizontal strokes separates most lines of text, only R l. 17 to lower edge l. 21, and V ll. 22-23 being undivided in this way. De Moor considers it to be an incantation against infertility.

1.13 R 1

[from the wo]mb[?][1] you are born[2].

[ext]erminate[3] on the second day,

fe[ll[4] on the third] day,

1.13 R 5 slay on [the fou]rth day.

Sever hands,

1. Most commentators read r]*ḫm.tld*, (thus *CTA*) and consequently restore [*r*]*ḫm* (*KTU*[2] [ ]r*ḫ*m.t*ld*), translated as 'Maid', 'Damsel', etc., a putative epithet of Anat (but rather 'the womb [of Anat?]'). Only *tld* is supported by examination of the tablet. Cf. n. 77 to KTU 1.6 ii 5.

2. Or: 'she is born', or 'she bears'; 'may [she] bear': de Moor (1980a: 305). The passive is preferable. Cazelles (1956: 51), 'you shall bear'.

3. Restoring [*tš*]*ḫrm* (see also next note; cf. Heb. √*ḥrm* hiphil): the construction is a tricolon, with three verbs for killing, Caquot (1989: 21-22), del Olmo (1981a: 492; 1984: 88), de Moor (1980a: 305; 1987: 138) and Lloyd (1994: 274). All translate the following phrase 'for two (three, four) days'. I understand it to mean that Anat is born on day one, and from the second she is fulfilling her role as war-goddess.

4. Tentatively restoring *š* [*ql*...]. The verb *hrg* in l. 5 and *šql* here appear to be either m. sg. imper., (Anat treated as a warrior) or perhaps inf. abs. as imper. (*UT*, 79 §9.28). Perhaps [*tš*]*ḫrm* (previous note) should be read [*š*]*ḫrm*. Similarly with following verbs. They may have inf. force ('born...to slay, sever' etc.).

attach[5] [them] [6] to your girdle,
tie on the heads of[7] your warriors[8].
And fly with[9] your falcons
and settle on your mountain Inbub[10],
1.13 R 10 come[11] to your mountain (which) I know![12]
Lo![13] Come yourself[14] to your dwelling;
to the ro[of][15] of the high[16] [hea]vens go,

5. Cf. Walls (1992: 140), 'hands of your binding' (*šsk* cf. *šns* in KTU 1. 3 ii 12; note that the word-pair *'tk*, **šns* of KTU 1.3 ii 11-13 is used in reverse order on this interpretation). Many take Ug. *šsk* to be Š of √*nsk*. Thus Cazelles (1956: 51), de Moor (1980a: 305; 1987: 138) and Lloyd (1994: 274), 'pour out'. Caquot (1989: 22 n. 10), 'those who despoil you' (cf. Jer. 30.16).

6. If reading 'pour out' (previous note), restoring [*dm*]; cf. de Moor (1980a: 305), del Olmo (1981a: 492) and Lloyd (1994: 274).

7. Ug. *l*: or: 'from'.

8. KTU 1. 3 ii 11-13 would lead us to expect *bmtk* ('[tie heads] to your back'). The text *mhrk* is unexpected. Does it means 'warriors (you have slain)' and so 'enemies' (thus Lloyd 1994: 274)? Or 'those who have died in your service'? Cf. n. 17 to KTU 1.3 ii 7.

9. Ug. *ldr*['*k*] (cf. *dr'*, Heb. *zr'*). Lloyd's view (1994: 275 n. 53) that there is insufficient room for the characters is unwarranted.

10. Levine and de Tarragon (1988: 497) explain by √*nbb*, 'be hollow'. Cf. Wyatt (1996b: 47): 'without gates' or 'gateless' (*in* + *bb*). On *rbṣ* cf. de Moor's restoration at KTU 1.101.1 below. Anat descends a mountain at KTU 1.3 ii 5.

11. Ug. *at*: so Caquot (1989: 23), √*atw*; Gordon (1949: 52) reads as *at*, 'thou'. Others read the initial broken sign as *k* (giving *kt*, 'base'): thus *CTA*, *KTU*[1 and 2], del Olmo (1981a: 492; 1984: 88), de Moor (1987: 138), Walls (1992: 140) and Lloyd (1994: 275).

12. Cf. Cazelles (1956: 52).

13. Ug. *hn*: the tablet reads [ ]*n*. There is no warranty for *KTU*[1]'s k*t, followed by del Olmo (1981a: 492). *KTU*[2] corrects.

14. Ug. *atn at*: understood as G imper. of √*atw* with *n* energic (*UT*, 72 §9.11), followed by 2 p. ind. pron. Cazelles (1956: 52), 'come to us, come...'. Cf. Caquot (1989: 23). Cf. de Moor (1987: 138), 'I should give you' (similarly Walls 1992: 140; Lloyd 1994: 275).

15. The letters *bg* [ ] may tentatively be read. Thus *bg*[*g*]. Cf. del Olmo (1981a: 492) and de Moor (1987: 19).

16. So de Moor (1987: 138), Lloyd (1994: 275). We might expect *rmm*, after KTU 1. 108.7.

and run[17] towards[?18] the stars.
There [(your) warriors[?19]] shall fall[20] like poplars[21],
like the trunks[22] of ash-trees[23]...[24].

1.13 R 15 ...Penetrate[25] the boundary...
...and altar...
...above the stars
the (most?) gracious [ ] image[26].

17. Dividing *p* (copula) and *rṯ* : so Cazelles (1956: 52), del Olmo (1981a: 492; 1981b: 52; 1984: 88), Caquot (1989: 23 n. 19) and Lloyd (1994: 275, 276 n. 61); √*rṯ* (Heb. *rûṣ*, 'run' with Cazelles and del Olmo: *hapax* in Ug.). For other senses: Caquot (1989: 23 n. 19) and Lloyd (1994: 276 n. 61), 'break, crush' (*rṯ* imper. cog. Ar. *raḍḍa*, Heb. *raṣ*[*ṣ*], 'break'); de Moor (1980a: 305; 1987: 138, correcting to *prq*): 'cella'.

18. The end of l. 12 is damaged by the (repaired) break. Either *kt* (del Olmo 1981a: 492 etc.): 'podium'; de Moor (1987: 138): 'throne-base'; Lloyd (1994: 275): 'pedestals'; or *pt* (Caquot 1989: 23: 'smash') usually read. Is a scribal error possible? **tk*, 'towards (the stars)' makes better sense than either of these readings.

19. L. 14 begins [--] *r*×*m*: the × represents an erased sign: read **mhrm*, as in l. 7.

20. Others have *kbkbm* as subject (m. pl. in *t*-: *UT*, 74 §9.14): Cazelles (1956: 52), de Moor (1987: 139). 'She (Anat?) falls': Gordon (1949: 52); del Olmo (1981a: 492; 1981b: 52; 1984: 88): 'they (sc. building materials) fall'; Lloyd (1994: 276-77): 'may they (pedestals) fall'.

21. Ug. *lbnt*: cf. Heb. *libnê*. 'Brick(s)': Gordon (1949: 52), del Olmo (1981a: 492), Caquot (1989: 24) and Lloyd (1994: 276); 'old woman': Cazelles (1956: 52); 'white petals': de Moor (1980a: 306), both √*lbn* 'be white'.

22. Ug. *yrkt*. Cf. Heb. *yarkâ*, lit. 'thigh, flank, extremity' (as in Isa. 14.13). Thus either 'summit' (synecdoche: top for whole tree) or long-bone metaphor for tree-trunk.

23. Ug. *'ṯqbm*: cf. wood used for Aqhat's bow, *KTU* 1.17 vi 20 (*ṯqbm*). Thus de Moor (1971b: 349-50; 1980: 306), del Olmo (1981a: 492) and Lloyd (1994: 277). Cazelles (1956: 52): 'hunchbacks' (Akk. *išqubitu*); Caquot (1989: 24): 'strong ones' (Aram. *taqqîp*). See now Noegel 2000.

24. The lacuna at the beginning of l. 15 may belong to the following colon, or be a final word here parallel to *tpl*: *tmt* (cf. *RSP*: I, 278, §II 387), *tabd* (cf. *RSP*, III, 114, §I 215), *tpl* (cf. *RSP*, III, 115, §I 216) are conjectural restorations.

25. Ug. *ṯṯpn* (= √*ṣpn*?). 'Penetrate' (Ar. *ḍafana*): Rin (1968: 251), del Olmo (1981b: 57) and Caquot (1989: 25). 'Hide' (Heb. *ṣāpan*): Cazelles (1956: 52-53). De Moor (1980: 306; 308): 'drip (of sweat)' (√*nṯp*, *nṭp*).

26. De Moor's version (1980: 306; 1987: 139) is attractive: 'the [silver] of the image is more beautiful than the stars'. But the restoration of [*ksp*] is conjectural.

Let Virgin Anat wash herself;
1.13 20 [let the Beloved of the] Powerful One[27] bathe herself[28],
lower edge and let her go up to El [the Bull[29]] her father,
—the dwelling of your deeds be [ ]![30]

1.13 V May he hear you, O Cow,
and understand (you), [Beloved of ?] the Powerful One.

May (my) voice be in your ear,
and [ ].

Because you have bound up[31] evil[32],
1.13 V 25 since you have been clothed in light,

may the celestial messengers bless the prince;
may the celestial messengers[33] send you strength[34],

I shall bless your son(s) as a first-bo[rn],
(like) a prince I shall bless you.

1.13 V 30 Voracious was A[na]t the cow of Baal,

27. On this epithet see Wyatt (1992a: 417-19). The correction was suggested by Whitaker (1969: 73), discussed by del Olmo (1981b: 57) and adopted by Lloyd (1994: 278 n. 71). Text appears to read *tb* [ ]. There is no warranty for correcting to **td* and understanding 'Breast (or Nursemaid) of the Nations', an epithet dependent entirely on this reconstruction. (Thus Cazelles 1956: 54; del Olmo 1981a: 493; 1981b: 52; de Moor 1980a: 306; 1987: 139; Caquot 1989: 25.)

28. Ug. *tptr*ʿ. Dt of √*pr*ʿ: de Moor (1980a: 308), 'beautify oneself'. Gt of *pr*ʿ (cf. Ar. *'iftaraġa*): Caquot (1989: 25 n. 26) and Lloyd (1994: 278 n. 70). Cazelle's reading *tkr*ʿ (1956: 54), is prosodically improbable.

29. There is room for [*tr*] at the end of l. 20.

30. A glossed prayer by the scribe?

31. Ug. *rtqt* (Aram. *rᵉtaq*. 'tie', Ar. *rataqa*. 'close'). De Moor (1980: 309, Ar., Heb. *rātaq*) understands a woman whose vulva is closed against intromission.

32. Taking *mrġt* in the sense proposed by Caquot (1978: 17), followed by del Olmo (1981a: 584), Ug. √*rġġ*, Heb. *raʿ*, Akk. *raggu*. De Moor (1980: 309), equates *mrġt* with Akk. *marḫitu*, 'lover'. Cazelles (1956: 54), reads *mrġt*, 'milk'.

33. Reading *ml<a>k.šmm*, as in previous colon: de Moor (1980a: 306) and Lloyd (1994: 280).

34. The initial letter is damaged. Either *ḥl*, 'strength', or *ṭl*, 'dew'.

vo[ra]cious[35] was Anat to bring forth[36],
she whose womb had not known conception,
[ ]...suckling.

(5 unintelligible lines followed by gap of about 5 lines)

35. Reading *a<g>zrt* as *agzrt* in previous colon: thus de Moor (1980a: 306), Caquot (1989: 26), Lloyd (1994: 282 n. 90) and *KTU*^{2}. See *CTA*, 58 n. 4. Cf. the term *agzrym* at KTU 1.23.23, 1.23.61. In that text the term refers to gluttony; here its reference is sexual.

36. Or does the term *wld* have a more specifically erotic nuance here (perhaps 'copulate', even 'rut')? This passage appears to give the lie to P.L. Day's claim (1995: col. 64) that Ugaritic Anat is sexually inactive. Cf. also KTU 1.10 iii 7-10. See also Walls' negative assessment of the present passage (1992: 142-43). But hunting, warfare and sex tend to bring out similar emotions, and similar abandonment. (The English 'venery' covers the lot!) Note however the paradox of l. 31: the goddess bears, without having conceived. In Egyptian tradition she conceives but does not bear (PHarris 3.5-10). See discussion in te Velde (1977: 28-29), Walls (1992: 149-52) and Lloyd (1994: 95-98). It is possible that *wld* should be read instead as *ktld*, as at KTU 1.14 iii 48 and n. 104.

Part III
KTU 1.14–1.16

THE STORY OF KING KERET

(KTU 1.14 = CTA 14 = UT Krt = IK = RS 2.[003] + 3.324 + 3.344 + 3.414)
(KTU 1.15 = CTA 15 = UT 128 = IIIK = RS 3.343 + 3.345)
(KTU 1.16 = CTA 16 = UT 125, 126, 127 = IIK = RS 3.325 + 3.342 + 3.408)

Select Bibliography

Virolleaud 1936e, 1941b, 1942–43; Pedersen 1941; Ginsberg 1946*, 1969*: 142-49; Gaster 1947; Gordon 1949*: 66-83, 1977*: 34-59; Bernhardt 1955–56; Driver 1956*: 28-47; Jirku 1962*: 85-114; Aistleitner 1964*: II, 87-104; Gray 1964; Merrill 1968; Sauren and Kestemont 1971; Fensham 1971b, 1981, 1983; Herdner 1974*: 483-574; Gibson 1975, 1978*: 82-102; Clear 1976*: 31-49; Margalit 1976, 1995, 1999; Parker 1977, 1989: 145-216; Coogan 1978*: 58-74; Dietrich and Loretz 1980c, 1980d, 1980e; del Olmo 1981a*: 237-323, 1984: 105-13; de Moor and Spronk 1982a, 1982b; Xella 1982*: 158-79; Wyatt 1983a, 1997; de Moor 1987*: 191-223; Spronk 1988; Pardee 1997c*: 333-43; E.L. Greenstein in Parker 1997: 9-48*. (* indicates comprehensive translation.)

This lengthy narrative poem is variously described as myth (Gray 1964),[1] legend (Ginsberg 1946) and epic (Gaster 1947), or some intermediate stage between them.[2] Whether or not there is any historical basis for the work, Keret, apparently king of Khabur on the River Khabur (though a number of scholars have sought to give the narrative

1. For Engnell (1943, 1944) the Keret story is a thinly disguised fertility myth, and nothing other than a coded variant on the Baal Cycle of myths (also regarded as 'fertility myth'), while Albright (1936: 31-32) and Mowinckel (1941: 142-44) detected elements of the Adonis myth. For critique see Bernhardt (1955–56).

2. The wise words of Gibson (1974: 60-61) repay some attention. Perhaps neutral terminology such as 'narrative', 'story', 'poem' is safest. It is not essential to fit compositions into distinct categories of our own making. These remarks are also appropriate for Aqhat (KTU 1.17–1.19). But Merrill's (1968: 6) distinction, that stories about gods are myths, while those about human subjects are not, is naïve and no longer tenable.

a Palestinian setting: see Bernhardt [1955–56: 101-102 for survey] and most recently Margalit [1995: 217]), has been seen as an ancestor, real or imagined, of the dynasty ruling Ugarit in the LBA, in the period from which the archives date. This would be consonant with the motive suggested above for the present composition of the Baal texts, that is as a legitimization of the possibly rather shaky claims to the throne of Niqmad II, the patron of Ilimilku. What better way to proclaim a new age than to trumpet its illustrious past? History can always be created! Unfortunately we cannot by any means be certain on such issues, and the perceptive analysis of Parker (1977, 1989), recognizing in the story the interweaving of three common folklore motifs (with interesting parallels to Job), calls into question the entire ideological programme, for he sees the poem as essentially subversive of the old values.[3] The text does however reflect royal ideology, even if it offers a critique of it (Wyatt 1997, 1998a). Merrill (1968) is right in maintaining that the 'house' of Keret, sc. the dynasty, is a main theme of the story.

Some scholars have supposed the work to be incomplete (quite apart from gaps within KTU 1.14–1.16). Thus Bernhardt (1955–56: 111) wonders whether a tablet is missing between KTU 1.14 and 15. However, at least so far as any tablets beyond KTU 1.16 are concerned, in dramatic terms there is a powerful resolution of precisely the initial dilemmas with which the narrator has confronted Keret (the loss of wife and children),[4] though hardly in the terms that the king would himself have wished. The entire story hangs on the last five cola! Indeed, in an informal sense we have here the seeds of tragedy as a genre, in which the gods remorselessly visit on the hero the logical implications of a minor character-fault. Lapses of memory in a king lead to unforeseen consequences. The first tablet (KTU 1.14) is interesting in that it shows signs of reworking. Double lines representing column-divisions run down the middle of cols i and ii, showing that the tablet was originally intended to have eight columns of text. It is

3. Cf. Margalit (1999), who asks whether 'the author of Keret, far from preaching the doctrine of divine kingship, might in fact be condemning it by means of a lethal dose of parody'.

4. As will be seen from the notes to KTU 1.14 i, the debate as to whether the crisis involves one wife and her children or a series of wives is not finally resolved. I have adopted the former position because a choice has to be made in translation. There is something to be said for both views.

unlikely that the entire tablet is palimpsest, the present column lines having apparently been marked and used in preference.

Synopsis of the Narrative

1.14	i	The loss of Keret's family is described; the king goes to bed weeping. El appears to him in a vision, offering him wealth...
	ii	Keret protests that it is sons that he wants, not wealth. He is told to offer sacrifice, then muster his army to march against...
	iii	King Pabil of Udum, who will try to buy him off, but whose daughter Hurriy he must demand in marriage. Keret awakes from sleep, offers...
	iv	sacrifices as instructed, musters a vast army, and sets off for Udum. On the way he comes to a sanctuary of Athirat, and vows that if his enterprise is successful, he will offer the goddess twice his bride's weight in silver, and three times in gold. The army travels on and arrives at Udum.
	v	The city is besieged. After a week Pabil sues for peace, offering Keret wealth.
	vi	His embassy arrives. Keret rejects wealth, and demands Hurriy in marriage. The embassy returns...
1.15	i	Pabil reluctantly gives permission for Hurriy to depart.
	ii	Keret holds a banquet for the gods. El blesses him and foretells a fruitful marriage, guaranteeing the succession...
	iii	Daughters will also be born. The gods depart, and El's promises are fulfilled. Athirat remembers the unfulfilled vow...
	iv	Keret orders a feast for his officers...
	v	(It appears that he has become ill—cursed by Athirat—for) Hurriy tells the officers as they arrive to weep for Keret...
	vi	...It sounds as though the feast is degenerating into a wake...

1.16 i Ilhu, a son of Keret, weeps for the king, who tells him to fetch his youngest sister, saying that the king is holding a banquet...

ii Complaining at not being summoned earlier, she enters and weeps for the king.

iii Rites are performed to counter drought and famine.

iv The divine heralds are called upon to summon the gods.

v El asks who among the gods will cure Keret of his disease. When no one replies he creates a healing-goddess (Shataqat) from clay... He tells her to go to Keret...

vi Shataqat arrives and heals Keret. He tells his youngest daughter to prepare a meal. After eating he sits on his throne. Meanwhile his eldest son Yasib thinks that since Keret is dying (he has not heard the news!) it is time for him to go and take over as king. He goes to Keret, tells him he will now reign, and is roundly cursed.

1.14 i 1 [Concerning K]eret[5]

(6 illegible lines)[6]

5. I simply follow convention in transcribing the hero's name thus. On the problem see Watson (1994a). Versions such as Kirtu (de Moor and Spronk 1982a: 153; Spronk 1988: 62), Kirta (Coogan 1978: 53; del Olmo 1981a: 237; Pardee 1997c: 333: why the *a*?) are as conjectural. The retention of the consonantal skeleton (thus Parker 1977; Margalit 1995) is safest, but inelegant in a translation. Pardee (1997c: 333 n. 3) views the conventional 'Keret' as 'the least likely'. He is quite possibly right. On Kirta as a king of Mittanni see Wilhelm 1989, 28. If the name is Mittannian, it may represent Sanskrit *kṛta*.

6. For an attempt at reconstruction of the opening lines see Margalit (1995: 215-17). One result of his attempt is the positioning of Keret's town of Khabur (*ḫbr*) on the coast of Syria, *[*gblt y*]*m*: '[bordering on the se]a'. Attractive though this be, both in terms of the supposed real geography of the story, in relation both to Ugarit and to the cities associated with Athirat (at KTU 1.14 iv 35-36), and of its symbolic geography (kingdoms stretch ideally 'from sea to sea'), it remains entirely unprovable, only the final *m* of the putative phrase surviving. Margalit further locates Keret's kingdom at Byblos, and then (p. 219) links it with pastoralist kin in the steppes of central Syria and Transjordan. If we wanted to continue to speculate, we might consider Keret the eponym of the Cretans, who appear, apparently among the Philistines, as mercenaries of David, the so-called 'Cherethites' (*krētîm* rather than *kᵉrētîm*) of 2 Sam. 15.18 etc. This link was already suggested by Virolleaud (1936c: 9). But the link with Ditan (see n. 156 at KTU 1.15 iii 15), even if it is

1.14 i 7 The family of [Keret] was laid waste[7],
the house of the [k]ing destroyed[8],
which had seven [bro]thers in it,
eight sons of one mother[9].

1.14 i 10 (As for) Keret, his offspring[10] was destroyed,
(as for) Keret, ruined was his posterity[11].
A rightful wife he had indeed obtained,
a lawful spouse (with bride-price paid)[12],
A woman he had married[13],

fictitious, contains an important ideological reference, and offers circumstantial support for the normal location in eastern Syria.

7. Reading [ ]*'rwt* (thus *KTU*[1 and 2], rather than *CTA* [ ]*rpat*: but cf. *CTA*, 61 n. 3). √*'rw*, Heb. *'ārâ*, 'be naked, bare'. Cf. Akk. *urru*, 'bare place'. The nuance of the Ug. is determined by parallelism.

8. Text *itdb*. Read *itbd*, as proposed by Ginsberg (1946: 33). Virolleaud had toyed with a metathesis (1936e: 53) but to no purpose.

9. The reference is to Keret's *one* wife and *seven* sons. Thus already Ginsberg (1946: 14), and followed by, e.g., Gray (1964: 11), Dietrich and Loretz (1980c) and Xella (1982: 158). Rather than seven wives, as supposed by Cassuto (1950), Sauren and Kestemont (1971: 194), Gibson (1974: 63), del Olmo (1981a: 290), de Moor (1979: 643-44; 1987: 192), Margalit (1996: 199 n. 31), Tropper (1996b) and Pardee (1997c: 333). Cf. the motif of seven *husbands* in Tob. 6.14-15. The brothers are Keret's seven sons, not his own brothers (as for Cassuto 1950; Merrill 1968: 7, 12; Sauren and Kestemont 1971: 194; Gordon 1977: 37; Margalit 1995: 219). Parker's comparative treatment (1977) of Keret and Job strongly supports the 'sons' approach in preference to the 'wives' approach. The idea that Keret had gone through an entire gamut of wives before finally solving his problems with an eighth (I am reminded of that coy modern phrase 'serial monogamy'!) is less convincing, by comparison with the hero who has lost an entire family (one wife and seven children), and then starts all over again (and perhaps doubles their number, a sign of divine blessing). *This* is the stuff of all the folk-ethics crammed into such a tale. Given that royal polygamy was probably normative in Ugarit and in other ancient Syrian royal courts, the wives approach seems eminently sensible; but the royal line went through the *rabitu*, not just any wife: so as far as the succession was concerned, only one wife mattered. Having said this, I am happy to concede that the wives option is no more difficult than the sons option in grammatical terms.

10. Ug. *ḥtkn*. Gray (1964: 11): 'our sire', taking suffix as 1 pl. The suffixed *n* as 3 m. sg. is not so common as *h*, but is found (*UT*, 36 [§6.8], 149).

11. Ug. *mknt*. √*kwn*, 'to beget'. Cf. KTU 1.23.54.

12. Ug. *mtrḫt yšrh*: lit. 'a bride-priced one of his righteousness'.

13. The sequence *yšrh aṯt trḫ* is translated by Virolleaud (1936e: 35) as 'expels

but she went away[14].

1.14 i 15 Children their mother had borne him[15],
but a third died at birth[16],
a fourth of disease,
a fifth pestilence gathered to itself[17],
1.14 i 20 a sixth the sea engulfed[18],
a seventh[19] of them fell to a weapon[20].

the wife of Terah', in accordance with his general attempt to locate the narrative in Palestine and establish links with the biblical patriarchal tradition. Some of this early scholarship now looks rather quaint, but we should appreciate the difficulties facing the early interpreters of Ugaritic: we build on the shoulders of giants.

14. Ug. *tb't*. De Moor and Spronk (1982: 155): 'rebelled'.

15. Ug. *ṯar um tkn lh*. De Moor and Spronk (1982: 156), supplying <*l*> before *tkn*, translate 'he procured a mother, but she was <un>faithful to him' (also de Moor 1987: 192). They support the multiple wife approach, and thus run through the gamut of female failures.

16. Ug. *ktrm*. 'Childbirth': de Moor and Spronk (1982a: 156), Margalit (1996: 199 n. 31), which would fit the notion of seven wives. 'Health': del Olmo (1981a: 290, 569), the *-m* being presumably adverbial. But why would they die 'in health'? Death is usually associated with a lack of health. Every other cause of death listed here is an interruption of normality, though childbirth is admittedly a normal process which can go disastrously wrong. Van Selms discusses the √*ktr* (1979). His discussion seems to assume that divine functions can be restricted to philological possibilities, an implausible basis for theology.

17. That is, they died of disease, perhaps attributed to Reshef as god of pestilence.

18. That is, they drowned, perhaps attributed to Yam the sea-god. Following the proposal of Ginsberg (1946: 34) to read *ġlm* as vb (cf. Heb. *'ālam*, 'conceal, hide') rather than as n. pl. cs. (thus de Moor 1987: 192, 'the lads of Yam') or sg. (thus del Olmo 1981a: 290, 'mighty Yam'). In both these cola, we should not necessarily read a mythological sense into the phrase, which may be neutral (as a dead metaphor) for dying of disease and drowning. Cf. the phraseology of KTU 2.10.11-13 (Cunchillos 1989: 279).

19. The series of numerical terms contains a number of problems, and remains unsolved, in view of the failure to reconcile different assessments. Ug. *mṯlṯt, mrb't, mḫmšt, mṯdṯt, mšb'thn*. Cassuto took these to be denom. forms referring (as f. D pass. pts.) to the mothers. The reason the series starts with the third is that the first two were, on his understanding, already dealt with in ll. 12-15: ('his lawful wife did he send forth, his legitimate bride', ll. 12-13, and 'a[nother] woman did he marry, but she also went back; an occlusion at her womb did she have', ll. 14-15). While this analysis has something to be said for it, explains the f. forms, and solves the problem of the series of numerals beginning at the third, other scholars are agreed

Keret saw his offspring,
he saw his offspring[21] destroyed,
quite ruined his dwelling[22];

that these terms are however fractions. This has given rise to ingenious explorations of the arithmetical games the poet is supposedly playing with his hearers (and readers). See in particular Finkel (1955), Tsumura (1984) and Sasson (1988). Gray (1964: 11, 32) takes the forms to be 'multiplicatives', referring to the ages of the children. For Driver (1965: 95-96) they denote the numbers of sons in groups, so that Keret had 3 + 4 + etc., totalling twenty-five. For my treatment see Wyatt (1987b: 393-94). Loretz (1995: 111-13) supports the fraction interpretation, understanding sons, while Tropper (1996b) has reverted to Cassuto's position.

20. Ug. *bšlḥ*. Most thus (*b* instr.), from √*šlḥ*, 'throw': thus, 'a missile'. Following the suggestion of Tsevat (1954), Coogan (1978: 58): 'in battle'. Dietrich and Loretz (1980c: 204 n. 67), followed by Xella (1982: 158 and n. 2), de Moor and Spronk (1982a: 156) and de Moor (1987: 192 and n. 9) take the term to refer to Shalḫu ('Thrower'), a deified river of the underworld. Cf. also del Olmo (1981a: 290). This proposal is attractive, since a DN would be appropriate here, if we understand the last three forms of death, however prosaic, to be attributed explicitly to malign divine intervention by Reshef, Yam and Shalhu. But a more neutral sense may be appropriate. None of these deities feature as characters in the story, as do El, (Baal, by reference), Athirat and Shataqat, so that the neutral sense of their names is plausible. Margalit (1996: 199 n. 31): 'fell from a parapet'. On any interpretation, Keret is evidently cursed. Such a catalogue of disasters is too much of a coincidence. The story raises precisely the moral theology problem explored in Job. But the author of Job, for all his high-flown poetry and mythological *richesses*, is nevertheless locked into the logic of (an incipient) monotheism. Where do you turn when the only way out is to blame God? One of the intuitive strengths of polytheism was that it contained moral issues strictly within a theological context, since all problems were dealt with 'intra-pantheonically'. Perhaps one of the reasons Job *is* so rich mythologically is that the author is trying so hard to get off the hook!

21. Ug. *ḥtkh*. It is the term *ḥtk*, 'progeny', already occurring in l. 10, which requires that the preceding sequence to this bicolon refers to Keret's children, and not his wives, an argument that I concede is otherwise finely balanced, with arguments in favour of both sides. Cassuto (1950: 19) avoids the problem by translating 'portion', referring to his wealth, an unconvincing analysis. The term can also mean 'sire' (cf. KTU 1.1 ii 18, ‖ [*ab*]), and is read as such in l. 10 by Gray (above). For recent discussion of the term see Loretz (1995: 114-16).

22. Ug. *ṯbth*. To be taken in the metonymic sense of the family dwelling there (√*yṯb*). Cf. the pun on *bayit*, ('house, dynasty') in 2 Sam. 7.1-17. Alternatively, the emphasis is on Keret's throne: cf. Gibson (1978: 82): '(kingly) power'; Coogan (1978: 59): 'royal house'.

and in its entirety[23] was the family destroyed,
1.14 i 25 and in its totality his succession[24].

He went into his chamber (and[25]) wept;
redoubling his lamentations, he sobbed[26].

His tears poured out,
like shekels to the ground,
1.14 i 30 like five-shekel[27] weights onto his[28] bed.

As he wept he fell asleep;
as he cried slumber (came).

Sleep overpowered him and he lay down;
1.14 i 35 slumber, and he curled up.

And in his dream El came down,
in his vision[29] the Father of Man[30],

23. The sense fits either reading offered here, *whtmhn* (*CTA*) or *wbklhn* (*KTU*[1 and 2]).

24. Ug. *yṛṯ* (Heb. *yrš*). The term covers inheritance and heirs. It comes right at the end of the long sequence narrating Keret's woes, and provides its logical as well as dramatic climax. It favours the 'sons' approach over against the 'wives' approach. This is no private disaster, for the succession to the throne and the future of his entire kingdom are at stake.

25. The copula is found with the following verb *wydm'*, perhaps an erroneous transposition.

26. Cf. remarks of Watson (1989: 131) and references.

27. Ug. *kmḫmšt*. I have divided *km ḫmšt*: with ballast form of *k*. Cf. del Olmo (1981a: 291) and Xella (1982: 159). De Moor (1987: 193), dividing *k mḫmšt*: 'like pieces of one-fifth' (sc. of a mina? the form being strictly fractional, as at l. 18)—notwithstanding de Moor and Spronk (1982a: 157). In any event, it is a larger weight than that of the preceding colon. The former reading *km* is almost certainly right. What is strange, and perhaps an error, is the ballast form *km* in the previous colon. Usual sequence is *k*...*km*... The progression here (one to five) is comparable to the formula 'thousand... ten thousand' (KTU 1.2 iii [10-11] and parallels). Reading *tmḫmšt*, Ginsberg (1946: 14) took this as a vb with following n.: 'his bed was *soaked* [his italic, as doubtful]'; but this misses the parallelism. Cf. KTU 1.19 ii 34, *rb't ṯqlm* ('quarter-shekel [weights]'), where however there is no comparison. Keret's royal tears carry greater weight than Danel's servants'! This is in keeping with the epic treatment of all royal emotions.

28. The *h* on *mṯth* may be directional (Heb. *he locale*), possessive, or both.

29. Ug. *ḏhrt(h)*. See Tropper (1996a), which provides the answer to Greenfield (1994). Cf. KTU 1.14 iii 51 (*hdrt*).

30. Ug. *ab adm*. The term is ideological, used of the deity as father of the king

and he drew near, asking Keret:
'What ails Keret[31] that he weeps,
1.14 i 40 the gracious one, heir[32] of El, that he groans?
Does he desire the kingship of Bull, his father,
or domin[ion] like the Father of Man?[33]

(8 lines missing, containing:)

[Take silver]
[and yellow gold,]
[a share in its production]
[and perpetual slaves]
[or charioteers with chariot-horses,]
[from the stable of a handmaid's son.]'[34]
[But Keret replied:]
1.14 ii '[Why should I want silver]
1.14 ii 1 [or yellow gold[35]],

as 'Primal Man', and in effect a god, since he is also *bn il* (KTU 1.16 i 20), and El is his father (*ṯr abh il*: KTU 1.14 ii 6), rather than having the more general sense of 'father of mankind' (thus, e.g., Gibson 1978: 83, but see n. 3). Cf. Gray (1964: 11), Xella (1982: 159): 'Father of men'. The same royal title is used in connection with Pabil in KTU 1.14 iii 32 (in a message containing the response he will give!) and vi 13.

31. Ug. *mat krt*: lit. 'What ails you, Keret' (continuing in 3rd p.): see de Moor and Spronk (1982a: 158). Keret as subj. requires a 3 p. vb.

32. The Ug. term *ǵlm* is notoriously difficult to pin down, but generally has a theological or ideological nuance. See n. 99 at KTU 1.2 i 13.

33. The question appears to be whether Keret hankers after a divine kingship, which is not appropriate to his station. However, it is the kingship of El which is at issue (cf. Isa. 14; Ezek. 28); a divine kingship of a kind already lies behind the traditions of Ugaritic royal ideology, with Athtar as the paradigm. See Wyatt (1986a, 1986b).

34. El is not prepared for Keret to have his (El's) kingship. He offers him a bribe to dissuade him from his imagined desire, a common folklore motif. But Keret is after the survival of his dynasty, more durable wealth than mere riches. For notes on the text see immediate sequel. On restitution of this text here see comments in de Moor and Spronk (1982a: 158-59).

35. The restored expression is *yrq ḫrṣ* (KTU 1.14 iii 22 and parallels). Ginsberg (1946: 36) draws attention to the Akk. form from Qatna: *ḫurāṣu arqu*, 'yellow gold'. The term is perhaps a hendiadys: cf. de Moor and Spronk (1982a: 159 and refs.), who offer a slightly different stichometry.

a share in its production[36]
or perpetual [slav]es[37],

or charioteers with chariot-[horse]s[38],
from the stable of a handmaid's son[39]?[40]

[It is s]ons I would beget,
1.14 ii 5 descendants[41] I would multiply!'

36. Ug. *yd mqmh*. Alternatively, 'a share in its (the gold's) mining' (lit. 'raising up'). Cf. Herdner (1974: 511): 'with the mine from which it is extracted'; Gibson (1978: 83): 'fresh from the mine'; de Moor (1987: 193): 'with its finding place'. Gray (1964: 12): 'in portion of its value'. This is preferable to 'a portion of his territory', since in parallel passages the 3 p. suff. remains constant. Xella (1982: 159): 'gold (items) with their pedestals'.

37. Perhaps slaves who will not claim redemption after seven years? Cf. Exod. 21.2; Lev. 25.45-46; Deut. 15.12; with Lev. 25.40. These biblical passages may reflect not distinctive Judahite, but broader levantine social practice of the first millennium. Cf. Hammurabi's code §§117-18 (*ANET*, 370-71) and Epzstein (1986: 119-24). The Babylonian code, with redemption after three years, is more humane than the Bible.

38. Ug. *ṯlṯ* [*ssw*]*m mrkbt*: 'charioteers, [hor]ses-of-chariots', rather than 'chariots with three horses', for which there is no evidence (*contra* de Moor and Spronk [1982a: 160] and de Moor [1987: 194]: 'teams of three horses'; cf. Ginsberg [1946: 36]). See discussion in Dietrich and Loretz (1979: 197), Vervenne (1987) and Vita (1995: 92-93). See also *ṯlṯ* in KTU 1.14 ii 36 (and n. 58) and parallels, and del Olmo (1984: 177-85). Xella (1982: 159): 'bronzes, horses, chariots', taking *ṯlṯ* in sense of √ III, *UT*, 503 §2691, perhaps 'third metal', after gold and silver? On this line of enquiry, cf. *alaš* as loanword for 'copper' (Reiter and Plöchl 1993), thus explaining Alašia as Cyprus, 'Copper-Land'. See also n. 62 to KTU 1.14 ii 36.

39. The expression *bn amt* is probably not as neutral as most scholars suppose. In Pss. 86.16 and 116.16 it refers specifically to the king. The language is ideological. On the colon cf. Wyatt (1990c: 21-22). Xella (1982: 159) reads the colon as 'stables, servants'. Cf. de Moor and Spronk (1982a: 160), who take it as 'bondmen'. In view of the ideological nature of the expression *bn amt* it is possible that it is in the mouth of a king a self-designation (with perhaps a hint of self-deprecation before a god?). If so, the colon means by way of circumlocution simply 'my stable'. When Pabil says this (KTU 1.14 v 38, vi 8) he is offering to trade economic benefits for peace.

40. The prosody and hence the syntax of this section is understood very differently by different translators and commentators. Other versions should be compared.

41. It seems that a parallel for *bnm* (*KTU* [2]: [ ]×*nm*) is required. The text reads [ ]*šrm* (thus *KTU* [1 and 2]): the right stroke of a *š* may be tentatively read. Is this an

And Bull, his father, El re[plied][42]:

'[Desist] from weeping, Keret,
from crying, gracious one, heir of El.[43]

Wash yourself and rouge yourself[44];
1.14 ii 10 wash your [han]ds to the elbow,
[your] finge[rs] up to the shoulder.

Enter into [the darkness of the tent shrine].

Take a lam[b in] your [hand],
a sacri[ficial] lamb [in] your right hand,
1.14 ii 15 a suckling lamb in [them] both.[45]

error for **šršm* ('roots'), or to be restored as **bšrm* (*m* encl., 'flesh'). Or is **šrm* to be taken as a complete word? In this case perhaps it extends the sense of sons to royal sons, thus 'princes', as for Xella (1982: 159). Ginsberg (1946: 15) reads [*ṯa*]*rm*, (cf. *CTA* [ ]*rm*): 'kinsmen'. Cf. Driver (1956: 28-29): 'kin' and Herdner (1974: 511 and n. h): '[chil]dren'.

42. Reading *w*[*yṯ*]*b*, with *KTU*[1 and 2], rather than *w*[*yqr*]*b* offered on grounds of space by de Moor and Spronk (1982a: 160). Too *much* space is not a logical problem in restoring a text, though the overall context is an important consideration. With *w*[*yqr*]*b* there is no introduction to the direct speech. *CTA* [*wy'n*].

43. Note different syntax for these three cola offered by de Moor and Spronk (1982a: 160). For the present bicolon see discussion by van der Westhuizen (1985).

44. De Moor and Spronk (1982a: 160) rationalize this as scrubbing till the skin is red! A more satisfactory explanation seems to me to be the ritual application of red ochre, widely attested in the ancient world. Cf. Whittle (1996: 98, 100 [Varna], 130 [Hungary], 132 [Sredny Stog culture], etc.), Gimbutas (1991: 174, 286-87 [Malta], 370 [Crimea], 386 [Rumania]), Mellaart (1973: 256 [Shanidar], 272 [Tell es Sawwān], 274 [Hassūnah], 290 [Ḥajji Fīrūz], 312, 319 [Çatal Hüyük]), Mallowan (1970: 389 [Sialk]), Anati (1963: 174 [Einan], 256 [Jericho]). Many of the incidences noted here, dating from the Mesolithic, but attested both earlier and later over a vast area, concern burials, though the use of red ochre was not exclusively mortuary, being evidently used in general ritual contexts. But such an association may well explain the term 'rouging oneself' used of Keret in the Ugaritic texts (KTU 1.14 ii 9, iii 52), where he seeks to prepare himself for a procedure which will save him from extinction, since his children are all dead. The only other person to whom this action is attributed is Pughat, who performs it precisely because it is a masculine one. See n. 266 at KTU 1.19 iv 42.

45. One lamb is probably intended. Xella (1982: 160) translates the last term (*lla*) as 'kid', which would distinguish between them. Technically he is probably right (cf. KTU 1.4 vi 43), prosodically less convincing.

Take the appointed portion of [your] offering[46]-b[read],
dreg-[free] wine as a (drink-)offering[47];

pour out wine from[48] a silver[49] [rhyt]on,
honey(ed wine)[50] from a rhyton of [g]old;

46. Ug. *dnzl*. For discussion see de Moor and Spronk (1982a: 161) and Aartun (1985: 1-2), based on Ar. *nzl*, 'food offered to guests'. Renfroe (1992: 136-37, not noting Aartun) is sceptical. See also discussion in Watson (1992b). The sense offered is at best provisional.

47. Ug. *msrr 'ṣr dbḥ*. Two entirely different approaches are possible here. I have followed Aartun (1984: 49; 1985: 11), construing the words as follows: *msrr*, from √*srr*, 'remove', signifying the removal from wine of solid materials; *'ṣr*, cognate with Ar. *'aṣīr*, 'sap, juice, wine must', JAram. and Syr. *'eṣārā'*, 'sap, extract'. As for *dbḥ*, while its basic meaning is 'slaughter' (e.g. for sacrifice), it may have the extended sense of 'offering' or 'feast' as below, KTU 1.16 i 40, and in KTU 1.114. Here I take it to be a fluid offering, accompanying the lamb. The alternative is to see in *msrr* √*srr* (Ar. *sarra*, 'secret'), denoting the inwards (sc. internal organs) or choicest part of the victim (*UT*, 452 §19.1798). The following *'ṣr* is then readily explained as 'bird', Akk. *iṣṣuru*, Ar. *'uṣūr* (*WUS*, 239 §2080; *UT*, 460 §19.1905; *DLU*, 91), *'ṣr dbḥ* being 'sacrificial bird' (thus most). On the approach taken above, we have three cola (a tricolon) describing the animal victim, one the cereal offering(?) (note Renfroe's conjecture), and finally three cola (a tricolon or monocolon followed by bicolon as above) dealing with libations. A symmetrical sevenfold pattern then emerges, representing the comprehensive nature of the preparations for the cult. This will be performed on the tower in the following cola. On *msrr* cf. Gray (1964: 37). De Moor and Spronk (1982: 161) take it to mean 'fly' (Eth. *srr*, D form); cf. de Moor (1987: 194): 'fowl, a sacrificial bird'. This seems tautologous.

48. Here and in the following colon I have rendered *b* as 'from' rather than 'into': it is a question of libations. And perhaps also of where they are poured out. I have them poured out on the ground before Keret ascends the tower. Alternatively, he climbs up, and thus pours the wine into the ritual vessels before carrying it up. Cf. n. 53.

49. The usual word for 'silver' is *ksp*; here the more recherché term *ḫṯṯ* is used. This may have lent an air of sophistication to the scene. Gordon (*UT*, 400 §19.916) relates it to Eg. *ḥḍ*, 'white' (with *nbw* det. means 'silver'); Gray (1964: 37) calls it 'Anatolian'; *DLU*, 184 relates it more specifically to Hitt. **ḫat*. Both may be right: a precious substance might well have had an international vocabulary (cf. *šmrḫ/k/gt*, 'emerald', at KTU 1.4 i 32 and n. 90), as did other important commodities.

50. Ug. *nbt*. Being parallel to *yn*, 'wine', this may mean rather 'honeyed wine' than simply 'honey'. But it still evidently involves the ritual use of honey. See McKenna (1992: 138-41) on its importance . Cf. *arbdd* at KTU 1.1 ii [21]—and n. 15—parallels and n. 33 to KTU 1.41.21.

1.14 ii 20 go up to the top of the tower[51],
mount up to the summit of the wall.
Lift up your hands to heaven,
sacrifice to Bull your father, El.
1.14 ii 25 Serve[52] Baal with your sacrifice,
the Son of Dagan with your food.[53]
Then come down, Keret, from the roof,
prepare[54] food for the city[55],
wheat for the house of Khabur[56];

51. The line appears to be dittographic, *pace* de Moor and Spronk (1982a: 161).

52. 'Serve'. Ug. *šrd*. This may alternatively be construed as Š imper. of *yrd*, ('cause to come down'): thus, e.g., Driver (1956: 31), Xella (1982: 160) and de Moor (1987: 195). Virolleaud (1936e: 39), followed by Gray (1964: 38) and del Olmo (1981a: 297: 'honour') looks instead to √*šrd* (Heb. *śʿrād*), occurring in Exod. 31.10 (cf. BDB, 975). Cf. also Heb. *šērēt*, Pi., 'serve', proposed by Held (1954). The theology of the Keret story favours the latter, for it is El, patron of kings, who is most directly concerned with Keret's interests.

53. The whole sequence here raises interesting problems on precise cultic procedure. Are the libations poured out down below or up on the roof? Is it El's temple or Baal's temple in Ugarit that provides the model? (The only candidate for an El-temple so far is the 'temple aux rhytons', but this looks increasingly like a *marzihu*-construction: see de Tarragon [1995: 204-206]. Perhaps it is yet to be discovered.) How does the 'sanctuary' (tent-shrine? *ḫmt*) relate to the place of sacrifice? Is this the Ugaritic sacred precinct in any case, since Keret is king of Khabur? All these questions remain open. Cf. Schaeffer (1939b: 126 n. 2) and further discussion and references in Ginsberg (1946: 37).

54. 'Come down... prepare'. Ug. *yrd*...*'db*. I have taken as imper. forms. They could also be jussives: 'let Keret come down...let him prepare'. Thus, e.g., del Olmo (1981a: p. 293, second form inf.), de Moor (1987: 195). For *'db* I have here adopted the neutral sense. But given that Keret is told to perform this task immediately on coming down from the (temple-) tower, *'db* may carry the cultic sense of 'offering' found elsewhere, as at KTU 1.6 ii 22. Similarly at KTU 1.14 iv 9.

55. Ug. *qryt*. In view of the anomalous spelling (we should expect *qrt* in the sg.; note the du. *qrytm*) Herdner (1974: 515 and n. x) proposes seeing it as a cognate of Akk. *qaritu*, translating '(coming) from the granaries [*sic* pl.]'. Cf. next note.

56. Albright (1943a) suggested that this means 'the granary' rather than a TN. This, Driver's similar proposal (1956: 31)—cf. also Herdner in previous note—and other early suggestions are rejected by Badre *et al.* (1976: 107), del Olmo (1981a: 550) and de Moor and Spronk (1982a: 163) in favour of a TN. The form *bt ḫbr* here is probably to be identified with *ḫbr* by itself (KTU 1.15 iv 8-90), the *bt* being part

1.14 ii 30 let bread of the fifth month('s harvest) be cooked,
food of the sixth[57] month's.
Let a force[58] be victualled[59]
and let it set out.
Let a mighty host[60] be victualled,
and let a force go forth[61].

of the TN (cf. Bet Shemesh, Bet Shean etc.). Astour (1975: 284-85 §40) locates it tentatively on the River Khabur (modern Nahr al Khabour), a tributary joining the Euphrates just below Deir ez Zor. Margalit, as we noted above (n. 6 to KTU 1.14 i 1), locates it on the coast at Byblos.

57. 'Fifth...sixth': Ug. *ḫmš...tdṯ*. While the first form can be cardinal or ordinal, the second is only ordinal (the cardinal 'six' is *ṯ ṯ*). This clinches the argument over translation. The reference is to the fifth and sixth months; that is, if the first month fell in September–October, in February–March. But since that is early for cereal harvests in Syria it may be rather periods of five and six months from sowing to harvesting. Unfortunately we cannot confirm an eastern location, for even if Khabur be in the east, the fact remains that the poem in its present form was composed or at least redacted in Ugarit, and therefore no doubt reflected the local climate. However the dating problem be solved, we should follow Gray (1964: 38), followed by Gibson (1978: 84) and de Moor (1987: 195) in understanding different cereal crops (barley and wheat respectively) harvested in successive months, rather than those who think in terms of a campaign lasting five or six months (e.g. Driver 1956, 31; del Olmo 1981a: 293; Xella 1981: 293, 1982: 160). Herdner (1974: 516 and n. y) tries to have her bread and eat it. In the Gezer calendar (Albright 1943b; Cassuto 1936; *ANET*, 320) barley-harvest and (wheat-?) harvest are in the eighth and ninth months respectively. See Pardee (1997c: 334 n. 20) for the view that it is hyperbole for a long campaign. While he is writing of Emar, Fleming's (1997b: 431) remarks on spring and autumn new years may reflect Ugaritic usage too (just as there are probably residual new year elements in both Pesah and Sukkot in Israel).

58. Ug. *'dn*. See Renfroe (1987).

59. 'Let...be cooked [l. 30]...be victualled'. Ug. *yip...ngb*. I take as internal pass. forms. Alternatively jussives: 'let him cook...victual'. Dietrich and Loretz (1980d: 193): 'equipped'.

60. Ug. *ṣbu ṣbi*. Perhaps read second word *ṣbi<nt>*? Lit. 'a host of hosts', with superlative force. Cf. Gibson (1978: 84 n. 9).

61. This colon ends with the particle *m'*. Gray (1964: 39) and Gibson (1978: 151): '(all) together' (Ar. *ma'ân*). Gordon (*UT*, 435 §19.1511): enclitic after imperative (citing Eg. *m'*). Cf. *WUS*, 189 §1616, del Olmo (1981a: 581). I have omitted it from the translation. Ginsberg (1946: 37) links it tentatively with Heb. *mā'â*, perhaps 'grain of sand', and an allusion to the army's size? For the simile in military context cf. 1 Sam. 13.5 (the Philistine army) and 2 Sam. 17.11 (David's force) (Heb. *ḥôl*).

1.14 ii 35 Let your host be a mighty army:
a million charioteers[62],
mercenaries[63] without number,
archers[64] beyond reckoning.

Let them march in their thousands like the downpour[65],
1.14 ii 40 and in their ten thousands like the early rains[66]

62. Ug. *tlṯ mat rbt*: the first term could be construed as 'three', in which case the line means three million: 3 times 100 times 10,000 (thus, e.g., Watson 1979a: 114; Dietrich and Loretz 1980d: 193; Xella 1982: 161; de Moor and Spronk 1982a: 164). But it seems that three military categories are listed in the tetracolon (monocolon and tricolon?): the army and then its constituent parts. So *tlṯ* is better construed as 'charioteer' (cf. Heb. *šālîš*), sc. the 'third man' in the chariot, of the team of three. Cf. KTU 1.14 ii 2-3 and n. 38 above and parallels. See also Ginsberg (1946: 36), del Olmo (1984: 177-85) and Vita (1995: 92). Note that the three successive cola list the military personnel without any particle, followed by a numerical qualification. (Thus the lack of any antecedent to *tlṯ* does not invalidate this interpretation.)

63. Ug. *ḫpṯ*. The sg. form counts as coll. Vita (1995: 136 n. 7) lists the authorities for this view, without comment.

64. Ug. *ṯnn*. 'Archers': thus Dietrich and Loretz (1980d: 193), del Olmo (1981a: 294) etc. For discussion see Vita (1995: 125-28). Etymologically, probably the 'second man' in the chariot. Perhaps cognate with Eg. *snn*, *UT*, 504 §19.2708; the Eg. term has an arrow det. (Faulkner 1972: 232, cf. Eg. *snw*, 'two' and *sn*, 'brother').

65. Ug. *ḫḍḍ*. A rain term rather than 'lightning', as proposed by Watson (1976a: 441: cf. Heb. *ḥāzīz*, 'lightning', Akk. *ḫadādu*, 'roar')? The Akk. in any case suggests rather 'thunder'. Cf. usage of *ḥāzīz* at Job 28.26, 38.25 and Zech. 10.1. The allusion may well be to the *roar* of a heavy downpour. This is to attempt to preserve a greater tightness for the bicolon. If the 'lightning (thunder)' option be preferred, it surely reverses the climactic order. And lightning is an inept figure for an army's passage. The approach of Xella (1982: 161: 'seasonal thunder || drops of autumn rain') seems to me to mix similes in an unconvincing manner, again with anti-climactic effect. The same argument applies to de Moor and Spronk (1982a: 164): 'thunderstorm'. It is the relentless, unceasing downpour as much as its noise that is the point of the simile. Dietrich and Loretz (1980d: 193): 'downpour'. The translation 'storm-clouds' (Pardee 1997c: 334) rather misses the point.

66. Text *kmyr*. The word-divider of *KTU*^{2} (*km.yr*) is not visible to me (close-up slide). But Gaster proposed dividing the signs thus, identifying *yr* (Heb. *yôrê*) as 'early [sc. autumnal] rain'. See discussion in Herdner (1974: 517 n. c). The main argument against it could be the lack of a *k* in the preceding colon to match the ballast *km* here, but Herdner cites instances of words in the *second* colon of a bicolon doing double duty. For *ḫḍḍ*...*km*<.>*yr* Ginsberg (1946: 16, 37) understood 'serried... massed', cf. Akk. *kamru*, 'heap'.

let them advance[67].

Two by two let them proceed;
let all of them advance in threes[68].

Let the single man[69] lock up his house;
1.14 ii 45 let (even) the widow be enlisted[70].

let the the sick man take up his bed[71];
let the blind man outrun the runner[72].

67. Ug. *aṯr*. Herdner (1974: 518 and n. d) takes this as a prep. See discussion in Dietrich and Loretz (1984: 57-62) and Husser (1995: 125 and n. 29). They also take it prepositionally, thus taking *hlk* in previous colon as performing double duty. But I think my approach is preferable: here is a classic verbal form (qatal || qatal) to balance it chiastically. See entries at *DLU*, 61-62.

68. While the literary force of this is the climactic process of the n., n. + 1 formula, are we perhaps to see here the infantry marching in twos and the chariotry riding in threes?

69. Text *yḥd*. (Cf. Heb. *yāḥîd*.) At KTU 1.14 iv 21 the text reads *aḥd*. There is no need to correct either, except on grounds of fixity of formulaic expression. The sense in both cases is the unmarried individual.

70. Or: 'hire herself out', sc. as a mercenary. Thus, e.g., Bernhardt (1955–56: 107 and n. 88: as a camp-follower!) and Xella (1982: 161). Inf. abs. followed by 3 f. sg. N. (Cf. Heb. usage with *śākar* N.) This is a complete mobilization, total war! This leaves unresolved the form of the inf., which looks like G, whereas we should expect N, **<n>škr*. Alternatively (Gray 1964: 13, 42) 'hire a substitute' (*škr* as n.), but this weakens the image, as does 'give a generous contribution' (de Moor and Spronk 1982a: 164).

71. Ug. *zbl 'ršm yšu*. As, e.g., Driver (1956: 31); Gibson (1978: 84), Watson (1979a: 116) and Xella (1982: 161). Or 'Let them carry the sick man on his bed': Herdner (1974: 518). Gray (1964: 13): 'the sick man be carried ... '. *zbl* can be subj. or obj. of the vb. (cf. Heb. *nāśā'*). The translation offered is to be preferred in terms of the hyperbolic style. See next note.

72. We have a series of increasingly ludicrous occurrences, so desperate is the demand of King Keret for manpower (person-power! see ll. 44-45 on the widow's contribution). All the conventions of military liability and exemption (cf. Deut. 20.5-9) are here ignored. Ginsberg (1946: 38) notes, 'there are no exemptions from this draft!'. The invalid will rise from his sickbed, and the blind man, who is no use to anyone, will rush headlong, and blindly, into the fray. This developing sense of the improbable supports Watson's proposal (1979a), followed by Fales (1984) and adopted here, that *mẓl ymẓl* is to be explained according to an Akk. usage *ḫašḫašu pētân birki ibi'a*: 'the cripple overtakes the swift-footed'. He accordingly takes *mẓl* as not an inf. abs. but as a pt. = n., and the vb *ymẓl* as compar. D, cognate with Ar. *mazana*, 'go away, flee', *maza'a*, 'run, gallop ... '. Del Olmo (1981a: 576) also cites

And let the newly-wed go out[73]:
let him abandon his wife because of[74] another,
1.14 ii 50 on account of a foreigner his beloved[75].[76]
Like locusts let them settle on the steppe,

1.14 iii 1 like grasshoppers on the edge of the desert.[77]

Ar. *mazala*, 'run'. Usually taken in quite the opposite sense, e.g. Herdner (1974: 518 and n. f): 'the blind will find his way haltingly'. Similarly del Olmo (1981a: 294). Cf. Emerton (1969: 22-23) and Xella (1982: 161). De Moor and Spronk's (1982: 164) translation, 'let the blind man donate generously', takes up their sense of the previous colon but one. They understand those who cannot help physically to assist financially (cf. de Moor 1987: 196 n. 24).

73. Cf. Deut. 20.7.

74. The *l* here is probably not to be construed as 'to' in view of the overall sense. The sense adopted here is also supported by the following ballast form *lm*. But see my remark at the end of the following note.

75. We may take the 'another... foreigner' to refer, with Bernhardt (1955–56: 107), Watson (1979a: 113) and del Olmo (1981a: 294), to the enemy, sc. Pabil. The sense of *nkr* II supports this. Cf. Heb. *nokrî*, Akk. *nakaru*. This bicolon could alternatively be translated as follows:

> let him abandon his wife to another,
> to an acquaintance his beloved.

This is to identify *nkr* I ('recognize') in the second colon. The approach of others, e.g., Dietrich and Loretz (1980d: 196), Herdner (1974: 519) and de Moor (1987: 196) seeks to combine the second overall sense with *nkr* II, which is implausible; it would mean that another is left behind to take advantage of the newly-wed's absence. Similarly Margalit (1995: 220), who is undoubtedly correct on the sociological data, but takes no account of the hyperbolic dimension. With *this* mobilization, there will be no one left, except the poor bride. Unless indeed she too is to go, to be abandoned to the enemy (sc. Pabil)! This would be to take the groom and the bride as conscripts together. Cf. previous note. This is *not* a passage to be used to illustrate the moral poverty of Ugaritic society. It is pure hyperbole. The whole description of the mobilization progresses from the normal (the single man) to the impossible. For comments on the sociological background see J. Finkel (1954).

76. The entire tricolon recurs with slightly different wording at KTU 1.14 iv 26-28.

77. It is difficult to see what function the double line performed here, since it bisects the bicolon. Did it perhaps mark a breaking-off point, the copying or dictation resuming afterwards? For the image of an army as numerous as a plague of locusts cf. KTU 1.3 ii 10-11, and note also the reverse image (of locusts behaving like a rampaging army) in Joel 2.3-9.

Go for a day and a second,
a third, a fourth day,
a fifth, a sixth day.

Lo,
at sunrise[78] on the seventh
1.14 iii 5 you will come to Udum abounding in rain[79],
and to well-watered Udum[80].

Then attack its cities,
invest[81] its towns[82],

78. Ug. *špšm*. 'Sunrise': e.g. Ginsberg (1946: 38), Bernhardt (1955–56: 110), Herdner (1974: 519) and del Olmo (1981a: 295). Or 'sunset': e.g. de Moor (1987: 196) and Pardee (1997c: 335). Gray (1964: 13, 44): 'with the sun', which he explains in the former sense. Cf. Gibson (1978: 85 and n. 2). 'Sunrise' would imply a forced march through the night—perhaps for six nights!—which fits in with the hyperbole of the passage. Cf. Richardson's comments (1973: 7 n. 5), and note discussion (with opposite conclusion) in de Moor and Spronk (1982a: 165). KTU 1.14 iv 46 reads *aḫr špšm*, 'after sunrise'.

79. Text *rbm*. Usually corrected to *rbt*. In view of the interpretation adopted here, the text may stand: lit. 'Udum of the rains'. However, parallels at KTU 1.14 iii 30, iv 47, vi 11 support the correction. The error is best explained as dittography of the word-divider.

80. There are various approaches to the expression TN *rbt*, TN *ṯrrt*: (1) 'rain-abounding TN, well-watered TN' (cf. Eissfeldt 1940: 72-73; Herdner 1974: 519; Caquot 1989: 91 n. 281); (2) Great TN, little TN (thus de Moor 1987: 196); (3) main city TN, citadel of TN; (4) 'Great TN, well-fortified TN', or some combination of or variation on these. Cf. also KTU 1.100.63-64, and *ṯr* in KTU 1.101.8. I have taken the first option as the most convincing. It is thus a question not of two parts of a city, but of two epithets in parallel, pertaining to the same city, and indeed, in view of the following bicolon, a state capital, followed with a reference to its satellites. Udum thus forms, perhaps, a classic 'city state', like Ugarit. The identity of Udum remains uncertain. Hardly Edom (thus Virolleaud 1936e: 41). Cf. discussion and references in Astour (1975: 267-69, §VIII 16) and in Margalit (1989a: 258 n. 21). Eissfeldt (1940) noted its possible identification with TN *udumu* in EA 256.24, which he located in the Beqaa, while Margalit took it to be in Bashan, as also de Moor and Spronk (1982a: 165).

81. 'Attack... invest'. Ug. (*w*)*gr*...*šrn*. The first term is not √*gwr*, 'dwell' (cf. Gibson 1978: 85, 'tarry'), but rather √*gry*, Akk. *gerû*, Heb. *gārâ*, 'attack' (*DLU*, 152). Cf. Herdner (1974: 520 and n. k), de Moor and Spronk (1982a: 166). *šr* is cognate with Heb. √*šwr* II.

82. 'Cities... towns'. Ug. *'rm*...*pdrm*. Pl. as generally understood. De Moor (1987: 196) takes both forms to be du.: 'twin-city... twin-town'.

drive from the fields the woodcutters,
from the threshing-floors the straw-gatherers,

drive from the well the water-drawers,
1.14 iii 10 from the spring the bottle-fillers.[83]

Rest a day and a second,
a third, a fourth day,
a fifth,[84] a sixth day.

Do not fire your arrows towards the city,
your sling-stones[85] at the citadel[86].

1.14 iii 15 And lo,
at sunrise on the seventh,
Pabil the king will not sleep[87]

for the noise of the bellowing of his bulls,
for the sound of the braying of his asses,
for the lowing of his plough-oxen,
the howling of his hunting-dogs.

1.14 iii 20 And he will send messengers[88] to you,

83. That is, bring the economic life of the community to an abrupt halt. Note that the social classes mentioned are those who would bear the first brunt of an attacking army. They are the first to suffer in any war.

84. Text *yms*: *y* dittography of *ḫ*. Read *ḫms*.

85. Ug. *abn ydk*. Lit. 'the stone(s) of your hand'.

86. Ug. *mšpdt*. I take it that a parallel to *qrth* is required. Following Gray (1964: 48, 'lofty burg'), who adduces Ar. *ṣadafa*, 'be tall', and Gibson (1978: 85, 152, 'citadel') who cites Ar. *sadafu*, 'object seen from afar'. Herdner (1974: 522 and n. p): 'propelled by your hand' following Rosenthal (1939: 222), √*ndp*, and also Bernhardt (1955–56: 108). Similarly del Olmo (1981a: 295). Cf. de Moor and Spronk (1982a: 167) and de Moor (1987: 197): 'throwing'. See also discussion in Watson (1994d: 270 n. 46), who favours de Moor's and Spronk's view. My interpretation provides a parallel to *qrt*.

87. If my six nights of forced march (n. 78) is correct, then Keret's discomfort will perhaps be mirrored by that of Pabil, who will spend the *next* six nights awake. Note that the same time-reference, *šp̄šm*, is used. I take it that his animals will be making noises of protest over the whole week at lack of food, rather than that they will merely wake up early on the seventh. (Cf. Herdner 1974: 522 n. q.) They would wake up early every morning even in peaceful times. Ginsberg (1946: 16): '... will sleep until...'. But this is to suppose that all is normal.

88. Ug. *mlakm*, du.

to Keret at his encampment[89],

"Message of King Pabil:

'Take silver
and yellow gold,

a share in its production
and perpetual slaves,

charioteers with chariot-horses
1.14 iii 25 from the stable of a handmaid's son.

Take, Keret, peace-offerings aplenty[90],
and begone, king, from my house,
depart, Keret, from my dwelling[91].

1.14 iii 30 Do not besiege[92] Udum abounding in rain,
or well-watered Udum.

Udum is a gift[93] of El,
and a present from the Father of Man.' "

Then send back messengers[94] to him:

"What would I want with silver
or yellow gold,

89. Ug. *mswnh*. 'To the camp' (Ginsberg 1946: 17, 39; Driver 1956: 31; Gray 1964: 14, 50; cf. Ar. *sawana*, 'wall around'). De Moor and Spronk (1982: 168): 'night-quarters'. Margalit (1995: 239) gives the most compelling argument in favour of the 'camp' interpretation, imagining that Hurriy, after a tearful farewell to her people, is delivered thither in KTU 1.15 i 1-8. I take the *-h* to be a 3 m. suff., relating to Keret, though it can also be directional (Heb. *he locale*). It could be taken as parallel to *mlakm*. See del Olmo (1975: 93-94): 'delegate, plenipotentiary', citing EA and Alalakh Akk. *massu*, 'committed, in charge', or OB Akk. *massû(m)*, 'chief, leader, expert'.

90. The text reads *šlmm šlmm*. It may of course be simply a case of dittography.

91. 'House... dwelling', Ug. *bty, ḫzry*. On the translation of *ḫzr* see KTU 1.2 iii 19 (n. 77). I have understood both terms to refer to Pabil's palace. If however *bt* refers to the entire kingdom (as 'House of Khabur' may denote the kingdom, or 'House of Omri' may have the same sense), then *ḫzry* should be interpreted in the broader sense of 'my settlements', 'my towns'. Cf. the Galilean TN Ḥazor.

92. Ug. *tṣr*, √*ṣwr*. De Moor and Spronk (1982: 168) prefer √*ṣrr*, 'harass, harry, vex'.

93. Text *ytna*. Usually corrected to *ytnt*.

94. Du.

a share in its production
or perpetual slaves,

or charioteers with chariot-horses
from the stable of a handmaid's son?

But what is not in my house you shall give:

give to me the maiden[95] Hurriy,
the most gracious one of your family,
your first-born[96],

whose beauty[97] is as the beauty of Anat,
whose loveliness is as the loveliness of Athtart[98];

whose pupils[99] are lapis lazuli,

95. Ug. *mṯt*. This becomes a routine designation of Hurriy. Cf. the m. form *mṯ* occurring at KTU 1.5 v 22 and n. 49 *ad loc.*, and below at KTU 1.15 iv 3 and n. 167.

96. Ug. *bkrk*. 'Your first-born'. The Heb. *bᵉkôr* is m. only in sg., though a f. pl. is found (Gen. 4.4). The only Ug. instances (all in the present text) are m., unless the form be taken as c. I am supposing it to be the station of Hurriy herself, which would explain her special standing in the eyes of the people of Udum (KTU 1.15 i 5-8). Cf. Herdner (1974: 524): 'the flower of your posterity, your eldest [f.!]'; similarly Gray (1964: 14) and Gibson (1978: 86). Alternatively, 'the most gracious of the family of your firstborn' (thus, e.g., Driver 1956: 33; del Olmo 1981a: 296; Xella 1982: 162; de Moor 1987: 197), though this would make Hurriy Pabil's grand-daughter. Any information which would clarify the situation is now missing.

97. Ug. *n'm*. Lit. 'graciousness'. But perhaps the precise nuance is 'beauty'.

98. De Moor's view (1987: 198 n. 32) that Anat and Athtart 'were the goddesses of love' is unsupported by any evidence, Anat's sexual activity with Baal notwithstanding. Anat appears to be a war-goddess at Ugarit; Athtart's role is unclear.

99. 'Pupils': Ug. *'q(h)*: cf. Albright (1936: 31), Ginsberg (1969: 144) and Gray (1964: 14, 54). Alternatively 'eyebrows' on the ground that the inlaid eyebrows of statues were of lapis lazuli or some other precious substance. Cf. the eyebrow inlays on the funeral masks of Tutankhamun. Levantine and Mesopotamian statuary frequently has recesses for such inlays. Gordon (*UT*, 460 §19.1906) makes the same point. 'Eyebrows' might be argued to give a more convincing parallel to *'p'p* in the following colon on the etymology of the latter. It is however the monocolon of l. 45b that clinches the issue. It could of course be objected that Hurriy's eyes would almost certainly be brown(!), but the description is probably based on statuary and its conventions. Note the wordplay between *'q* and *iqni*. De Moor and Spronk (1982: 168): 'eye-paint', de Moor (1987: 198): 'eye-shadow', on basis of Akk. *eqû*, 'to paint the eyes', *mēqītu*, 'eye-paint', etc. But this again loses the parallel with *'p'p*.

(the whites of) whose ey[es][100] are bowls of alabaster[101];
they[102] are surrounded by [eye-sha]dow.[103]

100. Ug. '*p*['*p*](*h*). 'Eyes', sc. the whites of the eyes. Probably derived as redupl. pilpel from '*ûp*, 'to fly', the fluttering of eyelids resembling the flapping of wings (cf. Heb. '*ap*'*ap*, usually rendered 'eyelid', but note Ginsberg's sharp comment [1946: 39], citing Ps. 11.4). It is preferable in any case to 'eyelids' (Herdner 1974: 525 n. c) on contextual grounds, even if it is eyelids—or eyelashes (de Moor 1987: 198)—rather than eyes which flutter. Besides, how does the bowl metaphor fit the eyelids or lashes? It surely evokes a rounded (white) bowl, which matches perfectly the curvature of the eyes themselves. The effect of fluttering the lids (lashes) can be to make the eyes *flash*. Besides, the eyelids would scarcely be white (cf. *trml*), and my interpretation of l. 45b, the following colon, supplies the requisite colour around the eyes. Hardly 'corneas' (Xella 1982: 162), as this would suggest that Hurriy suffered from cataracts!

101. Ug. *trml*. Herdner (1974: 525 and n. g) and del Olmo tentatively link with Amor. Akk. *šarmu*, translating 'alabaster'. Driver (1956: 33, 151 [misprint *trmn*]) 'onyx(?)...unknown precious stone'. Cf. Gibson (1978: 160). Gray (1964: 14): 'carnelian'. Note the different colours required by these translations: white, black and red respectively. De Moor (1987: 198 and n. 33): 'frothing milk'.

102. 'They': the eyes, rather than 'she', Hurriy. I take this to form the closing part of a tricolon.

103. I read [*s*]*dm*. The basis is Eg. *sdm*, 'to paint' (Faulkner 1972: 257). This was suggested to me by Wilfred Watson, who has drawn my attention to Troy (1994), who notes the elaborate symbolism of the ritual treatments of the Eye of Horus, and discusses √*sdm*. Watson translates as 'They (her eyes) are ringed by eyepaint'. Margalit's discussion (1995: 221-24) is also of interest with regard to this problematic line, though difficulties remain. As he notes, the colon surely deals with Hurriy's face, since the preceding two cola and the following monocolon all deal with her eyes (framed in a beautiful face, already introduced in the preceding bicolonic comparison with the goddesses). Most follow Pedersen's proposal ['*dm* (1941: 102, cf. Heb. '*ōdem*), and understand something like 'she is girded with [ru]bies'. Note de Moor's (1987: 198) interesting half-way house between the two approaches (writing eight years before Margalit). Nevertheless, it is always men who rouge themselves (e.g. Keret at KTU 1.14 ii 9—see n. 44—and iii 52 immediately below), and rouge would hardly go well with Hurriy's sophisticated make-up. Pughat's make-up, by rouging, at KTU 1.19 iv 42, is a special case, for she is actually putting on her war-paint! A better guide to Hurriy's procedures is surely the description of Anat making herself up in KTU 1.3 iii 1, where the goddess uses murex, presumably for the delicate purple shade about the eyes, or even mascara on the lashes. The entire description in the present passage is surely the hypnotic presentation of Hurriy's eyes, set about with women's crafts for maximal effect. (On the psychological basis for eye-make-up, cf. Jaynes 1982: 169-72.) I have translated 'eye-shadow' after de Moor, but with a different reference. (Cf. de Moor and

1.14 iii 45 I shall take my rest in the gaze of her eyes!
For in my dream El has granted,
in my vision the Father of Man,
that she will surely bear[104] progeny to Keret,
and an heir to the servant of El."'
1.14 iii 50 Keret awoke, and (it was) a dream,
the servant of El and (it was) a vision[105].
He washed himself and rouged himself[106],
he washed his hands to the elbow,
his fingers to the shoulder.
1.14 iii 55 He entered into the darkness of the tent shrine[107]:
lower edge he took a sacrificial lamb in his hand,
a suckling lamb in them both[108].
He took the appointed portion of his offering-bread,
dreg-free wine as a (drink-)offer[ing];
1.14 iv 1 he poured out wine from a silver rhyton,
honey(ed wine) from a rhyton of gold;
and he went up to the top of the tower,
he mounted up to the summit of the wall.
1.14 iv 5 He lifted up his hands to heaven;
he sacrificed to Bull his father, El.
He served Baal with his sacrifice,
the Son of Dagan with his food.

Spronk 1982a: 168, KTU^2: *[t]dm* on *'q*—explained above as 'pupils'—as 'eye-paint'.)

104. Text apparently *wld*. To be read *ktld*. Cf. S.D. McBride cited in Hendel (1987: 51 n. 48), endorsed by Watson (1989: 50, 52 n. 33).

105. Ug. *hdrt*. See KTU 1.14 i 36 (*ḏhrt*[*h*]) and n. 29.

106. Ug. *yadm*. Xella (1982: 163): 'put on ritual attire'.

107. Ug. *ḥmt*. Or: 'tent'. In which case it is a tent-sanctuary. Cf. the **ḥēmātô* of Ps. 19.7 as cultic tent (Wyatt 1995b: 571-72). Also restored at KTU 1.14 ii 12.

108. Note the apparent variation on KTU 1.14 ii 13-14: in view of the precise word order here (*imr dbḥ bydh*) the present reading can be justified. If a (rather complicated) haplography be argued, perhaps it is to be read:

lqḥ imr <bydh	he took a lamb in his <hand,>
imr> dbḥ <bm ymnh>	a sacrificial <lamb in his right> hand,
lla klatnm	a suckling lamb in them both.

Keret came down [from the r]oof,
he prepared food for the city,
1.14 iv 10 wheat for the house of Khabur.
He had bread of the fifth month('s harvest) cooked,
[food] of the sixth mon[th's].
He victualled a force
and [it set out].
A [mighty] host he victualled,
1.14 iv 15 and a force [went forth].
His host was a [mighty] army:
a million charioteers,
<mercenaries without number,
archers beyond reckoning.>[109]
they marched in their thousands like the downpour,
and in their ten thousands like the early rains they
advanced.
Two by two they proceeded;
1.14 iv 20 all of them advanced in threes.
The single man locked up his house;
(even) the widow was enlisted.
The sick man took up his bed;
1.14 iv 25 the blind man outran the runner.
And the newly-wed groom was led off[110];
he abandoned his wife because of another
and on account of a foreigner his beloved.
Like locusts they settled on the steppe,
1.14 iv 30 like grasshoppers on the edge of the desert.
They went for a day and a second.

109. The additional bicolon—cf. KTU 1.14 ii 37-38—is omitted, I suspect unintentionally. I hesitate to restore putative text unless there is compelling reason (as with examples in KTU 1.17 i 34, 1.23.51, 1.100.34-35 [edge note], 60). But if it is omitted here, we have an unbalanced army, represented only by its charioteers. Cf. previous note.

110. Text *ybl*, which I have read as internal pass.: he hardly went willingly! Cf. *yṣi* at KTU 1.14 ii 47.

After sunrise on the third[111]

1.14 iv 35 they[112] ca[me] to the sanctuary of Athirat of Tyre
and to the goddess[113] of Sidon[114].
There Keret the votary[115] vowed[116] a gift:[117]

111. As Cartledge (1992: 108) notes, Keret has studiously, even slavishly, followed El's instructions to the letter thus far. The sudden irruption of the following episode into the narrative at this point, interrupting his journey to Udum, lends a considerable emphasis to the episode. Since it is in many respects the most important single scene in the story (see further discussion below), this accentuation is appropriate. We should perhaps compare Keret's disobedience in not following El's instructions to the letter with the narrative of the anonymous prophet in 1 Kgs 13.11-26. His fate will be as disastrous, if not quite so bloody. See also n. 120.

112. Or, 'he'. Text *ym*[*ġy*].

113. In the Iron Age Ashtart appears to have been the chief goddess of Sidon (Jezebel's father, 1 Kgs 1.31; cf. 2 Kgs 23.13; Tabnit's sarcophagus: *ANET*, 662). Here *ilt* denotes Athirat, also goddess of Tyre, who may have been her predecessor in Sidon. Attempts to identify the two goddesses (e.g. Cartledge [1992: 108 n. 3]) are misdirected. On the Tyrian pantheon, and evidence of an older Asherah, with Ashtart and Anat an independent generation, see Du Mesnil du Buisson (1963).

114. 'Tyre ... Sidon'. Ug. *ṣrm ... ṣdynm*. The text is problematic. The TNs would be *ṣr* (KTU 2.38.3 etc.) and *ṣdn* (not found). We would not expect two enclitic *m*s, and they look like gentilics, though we would expect **ṣrym*, **ṣdnym* (read at UT 328.13 = CTA 93.13 = KTU 4.50.13 by Astour [1975: 317 §VIII 87]; now read as *lbnym*). There is a problem with the position of the *y* in the second. As to the location, see Astour (1973). The pairing of the two supports the identification with Tyre and Sidon, where most scholars locate the scene. See, e.g., de Moor and Spronk (1982a: 170).

115. Ug. *ṯr*. This title is applied intermittently to Keret in narrative references from this point on, (its occurrence in the lacuna at the end of KTU 1.14 i, as in Xella [1982: 159] being entirely hypothetical) culminating in its final occurrence at KTU 1.16 vi 54. Is its initial use perhaps a hint at the solemnity of his vow, which would have been accompanied by sacrifice (cf. *ṯ'y* at KTU 1.6 vi 57)? Albright (1936: 31) links it with ESA *ṯ'y*, 'to sacrifice'. On this basis, and supposing it to have some semantic link with *ṯ'y*, I propose the translation 'votary', which periodically reminds the reader of the seriousness of Keret's position once the time for fulfilment of the vow is past. The usual translation is 'noble' (e.g. Xella 1982: 159) or something similar (e.g. Herdner 1974: 529 and n. u: 'generous', thus Xella 1982: 164), following Virolleaud's suggestion (1936e: 8) that it is to be related to Heb. *šôa'*, 'noble, magnanimous'. Gordon (*UT*, 505 §19.2713, cf. §§19.2715-16) takes *ṯ* to be the name of Keret's clan, with *ṯy* as gentilic. For further discussion of the term *ṯ'y*, see refs. at KTU 1.6 vi 57 n. 131, and at KTU 1.40.24 n. 14, 1.119.8 (*ṯ'y*) and 11 (*ṯ'*) (nn. 11, 17) and 1.169.2 n. 10.

116. Ug. *ydr*, √*ndr*, on which see Boyd (1985).

'O Athirat of Tyre,
and goddess of Sidon,
if I take Hurriy to my house,
and bring the sacred bride[118] into my dwelling,
twice her weight in silver shall I give,
and three times her weight in gold![119,120]
They went on a day and a second,
a third, a fourth day[121].
After sunrise[122] on the fourth
they came to Udum abounding in rain,
and (to) [well-]watered Udum.
They attacked its cities,

117. Ug. *iiṯt*. The double *ii* is dittographic. Read *iṯt*, 'gift': Parker (1979–80: 27) and Cartledge (1992: 109-10 n. 3). The former attempt to divide it, linking the second part, *iṯ*, to Heb. *'iš, yēš*, as in Driver (1956: 33: 'As surely as ... exist'), Xella (1982: 164), cf. Gibson (1978: 87 and n. 4—inflected!), is superseded, as are the explanations offered by de Moor and Spronk (1982a: 170).

118. Ug. *ǵlmt*. See n. 99 at KTU 1.2 i 13.

119. We almost hope for Keret's sake that Hurriy is anorexic! This kind of formula is widely paralleled in both historical vows and folklore. Parker cites the vows of the Hittite Queen Puduḫepa, who is more realistic: she offers statues with only the hands, feet or head in gold! (Parker 1989: 72-75.) Keret's language is the hyperbole of the epic style of the narrative. See Cartledge (1992: 110 n. 3) for discussion of other approaches. There is no need to rationalize the present passage, or make it conform to common sense. The hyperbole is surely deliberate, even humorous. A votive offering on this scale would bankrupt a small kingdom. On the precise sense of the figures cited, see also Herdner (1974: 530 n. x). Cf. also the figures appearing in a broken context at KTU 1.16 v 8-9.

120. On the vow sequence see Parker (1979; 1989: 70-87) and Cartledge (1992: 108-15). Quite apart from Keret's stupidity in not taking care to fulfil so important a vow, there is the question of the implicit impiety of its making in the first place. See n. 111.

121. Cartledge (1992: 109) cites the new counting from one, rather than a resumption of the previous one ('five, six, seven') as telling against Parker's view of the passage as secondary to an older core. The new departure in the numbering further accentuates the literary significance of the vow episode, by having it deliberately break not only the flow, but the wholeness of a seven-day sequence. This temporal rupture is ominous. Cf. KTU 1.16 v 21 n. 270.

122. Ug. *aḫr špšm*. Note the simpler expression *špšm* at KTU 1.14 iii 3 and below at l. 7.

1.14 iv 50 they invested its towns.

They drove from the field the woodcutters,
and from the threshing-floor the straw-gatherers.

1.14 v 1 They drove from the well the water-drawers,
and from the spring the bottle-fillers.

They rested a day and a second,
a third, a fourth day,
1.14 v 5 a fifth, a sixth day.

<They did not fire their arrows towards the city,
their sling-stones at the citadel.>[123]

Lo,
at sunrise on the seventh,
King Pabil could not sleep

for [the noise of] the bellowing of his bulls,
1.14 v 10 for the sound of the braying of [his] asses,
[for the lowing] of his plough-oxen,
[the howl]ing of his [hunti]ng-dogs.

Then [King Pa]bil [alo]ud to [his] wife did cr[y out]:

'Listen, I pray...'

(15 illegible lines)[124]

1.14 v 30 '[Set your] faces[125], then, towards Ke[ret in his
encamp]ment,
and sa[y to Keret] the votary—

"Message of [King Pabil]:

1.14 v 35 'Take [silver]
[and yell]ow gold,

[a share in] its [production]
and [perpetual] slaves,

123. See Pardee (1997c: 336 n. 36) on the inadvertent nature of the omission of this bicolon.

124. Margalit rather optimistically reconstructs these lines (1995: 224-31, §VI).

125. Du. Messengers are usually sent in pairs. Cf. KTU 1.14 vi 35-39. See also n. 10 at KTU 1.1 ii 16 and nn. 88 and 94 above.

[charioteers] with [chariot]-horses
from the st[able of a handmaid's son].

1.14 v 40 [Take, Keret, peace-offerings] a[plenty[126]],

[do not besiege Udum abounding in rain,]
[or well-watered Udum.]

[Udum is a gift of El]
[and a present of the Father of Man.]

[Begone, king, from my house,]
1.14 v 45 [depart, Kere]t, from my dwelling!'"'

1.14 vi (about 4 lines missing)

[He sent messengers to him,]
1.14 vi 1 to [Keret at his encampment.]

They lifted [up their voices and cried]:
'Message of [King Pabil]:

1.14 vi 5 "Take s[ilver]
[and yellow] gold,

[a share in its production]
and [perpetual] slaves,

[charioteers] with [chariot]-horses
from the stable of [a handmaid's son].

1.14 vi 10 Take, Keret, pea[ce-offerings aplenty]!

Do not be[siege] Udum abounding in rain,
or well-watered U[dum]:

Udum is a gift of El,
a present from the Father of [Ma]n.

Begone, king, from my house,
1.14 vi 15 depart, Keret, from [my] dwelling!"'

126. See n. 90 to KTU 1.14 iii 26-27, where I suggested that *šlmm* might be repeated through dittography. If so, only one should be restored here. If it be argued that the available space requires the additional signs, it should be regarded as authentic. With entire lines missing at this juncture no certainty is possible. However, at KTU 1.14 vi 9-10 both *š*s are present, apparently confirming the deliberate usage.

But Keret the votary replied:

'What would I want with silver
or yellow gold,

1.14 vi 20 a share in its production
and perpetual slaves,

charioteers with chariot-horses
from the stable of a handmaid's son?

But what is not in my house you shall give:

give to me the maiden Hurriy,
1.14 vi 25 the most gracious of your family, your firstborn,

whose beauty is as the beauty of Anat,
whose loveliness is as the loveliness of Athtart;

whose pupils are lapis lazuli,
1.14 vi 30 (the whites of) whose eyes are bowls of alabaster.[127]

For in my dream El has granted,
in my vision the Father of Man,

that she will surely bear[128] progeny to Keret,
1.14 vi 35 and an heir to the servant of El.'

The messengers[129] departed without delay;
thereupon they set their faces towards King Pabil.

They lifted up their voices and cried:

1.14 vi 40 'Message of Keret the votary,
the word of the gracious one, [heir of El]:
...

(for continuation see restored
text at beginning of KTU 1.15 i)

1.15 i (at least 40 lines missing, containing):

["What would I want with silver]
[or yellow gold,]

127. Note that the two cola following this formula at KTU 1.14 iii 44-45 are omitted. Perhaps they should be read <...>.

128. Read *ktld*, as at KTU 1.14 iii 48. *CTA*, *KTU*[1 and 2] *wld*.

129. Ug. *mlakm* is du. On the following vbs as du. see Ginsberg (1946: 40).

[a share in its production]
[or perpetual slaves,]
[charioteers with chariot-horses]
[from the stable of a handmaid's son?]
[But what is not in my house you shall give:]
[give to me the maiden Hurriy,]
[the most gracious one of your family,]
[your first-born,]
[whose beauty is as the beauty of Anat,]
[whose loveliness is as the loveliness of Athtart;]
[whose pupils are lapis lazuli,]
[(the whites of) whose eyes are bowls of alabaster;]
[they are surrounded by eye-shadow.]
[I shall take my rest in the gaze of her eyes!]
[For in my dream El has granted,]
[and in my vision the Father of Man,]
[that she will surely bear progeny to Keret,]
[and an heir to the servant of El.]
...'"[130]

1.15 i 1 The hungry she took by the hand;
the thirsty she took by the hand.[131]
She set out on (her) donkey[132]

130. The missing narrative probably told how peace was made, and the marriage agreed, and appears to resume in the middle of an account of how dear Hurriy was to the Udumites.

131. Whether or not these are farewell handshakes and embraces, as supposed by Margalit (1995: 238), the image is one of a royal figure who moves at ease among the poor. Is a similar royal *Sitz im Leben* the basis for Isa. 55.1-3?

132. Ug. *ttṯkrn*. Most commentators have left the line untranslated. The vb (which has the appearance of 3 f. sg. Št of √*ṯkr*, but this is misleading) is *hapax*, and would appear, as Margalit (1995: 240) notes, to denote some action of Hurriy, between her tearful farewell and arrival at Keret's encampment. He proposes linking it to Heb. *yiśśākār* (K. *yiśśāśkār*), the Heb. tribal name, itself of obscure etymology. He draws attention to the expression *ḥ'mōr gārem* 'strong-boned ass' in the blessing of Jacob (Gen. 49.14), cf. Ar. *ḥimār ǧirmin*. He might have gone further, to say that it looks as though the form **śś kr(m)* may lie behind this, as a specific term for a wild ass (as though '*equus robustus*'!). The vb would then be denom. on this √. As to *śś*, it appears to be a by-form of *śśw*, 'horse', and may be

and they brought it[133] to Keret at his encampment.
1.15 i 5 (As) the cow lows for her calf,
young lambs (bleat) for their mothers,
so the Udumites lamented her.
Then Keret the votary said[134]:

1.15 ii (some 20 lines missing)

'...
1.15 ii 1 [ ]
[ ] Bull,
[Valian]t Baal,
[ ] Prince Moon,
1.15 ii 5 [Ko]thar-and-Hasis,
[ ] son(s) of Rahmay[135], Prince Reshef,
[and] the assembly of the gods in threes.[136']

related with other near eastern horse terms to Skt *aśva*. (That is another problem, however.) Another line of interpretation on the same √ might be 'she put a brave face on it': that is, she showed the defiance of the wild ass. This seems preferable to the interesting proposal of de Moor and Spronk (1982b: 173): 'should our slaves bring her [to you] as a tribute?'.

133. The tablet surface is very poor here. Virolleaud (1942–43b: 138) read [-] *bdn*, *CTA* .[--(?)]*dn*, *KTU*[1] .xxxb*u/d*n*, *KTU*[2] .x 'bdn (all Rom). A slide does not assist the decision-making process! My translation is conjectural, taking a putative [--]**bun* to refer to a Š form of √*bu* with 3 m. suff. *n* referring to the animal. 'They': her servants; or 'she'.

134. Ug. *y'ny*. If this means 'replied', then the previous tricolon may be the content of a message, (by Hurriy herself?) relaying the people's distress to the king. The whole passage is obscure. Cf. Ginsberg's restoration (1946: 21-22).

135. An appropriate guest-deity, since as queen, Hurriy becomes her earthly counterpart. Cf. her role in KTU 1.23, where she and Athirat appear to be hypostases of Shapsh. I believe that she may be present in Ps. 110.3 (Wyatt 1996b: 271-72, 284).

136. Gray (1964: 18) translates 'The Assembly of the gods, the three categories thereof'. Cf. Gibson (1978: 91 n. 2) and de Moor (1981: 205 n. 47). Handy (1994) groups the deities in four classes, 'authoritative deities', 'active deities', 'artisan deities' and 'messenger deities'. This is a modern perception for purposes of recognising their interrelationships in the texts. Presumably at the mythic level the gods participate in the marriage festivities. In real terms their images are brought to the ceremony. De Moor and Spronk (1982b: 174), de Moor (1987: 204-205) and Margalit (1995: 241-42) offer a more or less complete reconstruction of ll. 2-7. I

[T]hen Keret the votary served a feast[137] in his house,
1.15 ii 10 a party in his [ho]use he gave,[138]
and excuses he would not accept[139].
[After]wards there came the gods to the assembly,
[and] Vali[ant Baal] spoke:
'Come[140], O Wise One, perceptive [god],

accept Margalit's interpretation of the final colon (*-h* on *ṯlṯ* adverbial: Ginsberg [1946: 40]; cf. Herdner [1974: 537 n. f]). Their identification of Rahmay with Anat (e.g. Gray 1964: 58) is however unwarranted. Cf. KTU 1.6 ii 5 and 1.23.13. The assembly (*'dt*) of the gods, that is the council of the gods, is present, because since this is a royal wedding the destiny of the kingdom must now be determined in the light of Keret's new good fortune. Interestingly this indicates that the gods have little foresight, unless we are to suppose that they foresee what is to transpire (including Athirat, who is surely present, and whose presence cannot at any rate be precluded, though Margalit thinks she had rejected her wedding invitation), but simply agree that this is to be the course of future events. Cf. Jaynes (1982: 72-73) on the containment of the ancient gods within the constraints of human psychological perceptions. Del Olmo (1981: 303) interprets the passage as a list of divine recipients of Keret's sacrifices.

137. Text: Virolleaud (1942–43b: 142): ' [.]*r*, followed by Ginsberg (1946: 22) and *CTA*. *KTU*[1] š*r, *KTU*[2] *'šr*. 'Make a feast', Gray (1964: 18), followed by Gibson (1978: 91), del Olmo (1981a: 303) and de Moor (1987: 205).

138. I have construed *'rb* as parallel to **'šr*, and propose the following stichometry:

krt ṯ 'šrt bbth yšt
'rb bbth ytn

The form *'rb* as a n. would be construed as an 'entering' (cf. of sun, *DLU*, 88), here used as a social term for an assembly, its precise sense determined by the parallel 'feast'. Admittedly this leaves the following terms difficult to interpret, but nothing published so far makes that an easy task!

139. Ug. *w.yṣu.lytn*. See de Moor and Spronk (1982b: 174-75), de Moor (1987: 205), taking this as the second part of a bicolon (*'rb* antithetic parallelism with *yṣu*). Lit. 'But that one should go out he did not allow'. Cf. the compulsion in Lk. 14.23.

140. Ug. *tb'*. Lit. 'go, depart' (*UT*, 496 §19.2517). But it can hardly have a spatial sense here. El is the one god who does *not* move from the centre, a sign of his ontological and rank supremacy. Cf. nn. 63, 64 at KTU 1.2 iii 4. This tells against del Olmo's (1981a: 304) and de Moor's sense (1987: 205). I have understood it in a temporal sense, as initiating a new action. El properly inaugurates the ritual of blessing, which will confer on Keret the fruition of all the divine promises. Thus Ginsberg (1946: 22): 'come'; similarly Gray (1964: 18). Cf. Gibson (1978: 91): 'arise'.

1.15 ii 15 bless indeed [Keret] the votary,
give a blessing[141] indeed to the gracious one, [heir of] El'.

[El] took a cup [in] (his) hand,
a goblet in (his) [right] hand:

He did indeed bless[142] [his servant],
1.15 ii 20 he blessed Keret [the votary],
[he gave a bless]ing to the gracious [one], heir of El:[143]

141. See Pardee (1978b: 250). His article shows the difficulty for the usual interpretation 'strengthen', though he concedes that his 'bless' is a response to the demands of parallelism. See also Gray (1964: 18): 'grant thy benison'. Cf. however del Olmo (1981a: 304): 'will you not comfort?' and de Moor (1987: 205): 'fortify'.

142. Ug. *brkm ybrk*. I take this to be inf. abs. with encl. and finite vb (D stem 3 m. sg.), as do most commentators. Gray (1964: 19) takes *brkm* to be the du. n.: 'a double blessing he gave'. This would be in agreement with the fact that Keret's children appear to double in number, as the blessing delivered immediately below forecasts. It would also supply evidence in favour of the 'sons' view of the opening scene against the 'wives' view. The first word might alternatively be understood as the n.: 'with blessings' (as pl.) or 'with a blessing' (sg. with 'adverbial *-m*', pl. with pl. ending and adv. *-m* combined?—*UT*, 103-104 §11.5; this amounts almost to an instrumental usage). But we would not expect a pl. ending together *with* enclitic *m*, and Heb. n. *bᵉrākâ* is f., while *UT*, 376 §19.517, *WUS*, 582-83 §582, *DLU*, 116 do not list a n.

143. These five lines (one bicolon and one tricolon), expressed in formulaic language, allow the restoration of the defective formula at KTU 1.17 i 34-36. The formal use of the libation by El is significant, for this is a royal context, which applies also in the context of the blessing of Danel. See Jackson and Dressler (1975) who draw attention to the confirmation of the ritual tradition from the iconographic data. See in particular the stela RS 8.295, the decoration of vase RS 24.440 (probably a different god: Reshef?), the gilded bronze statuette of El (RS 23.394), and the recently discovered stone statuette of El associated with the *temple aux rhytons* (RS 88.70): Yon 1991: 336 (§§16a, 16b), 337 (§§17a, 17b). With reference to the bronze statuette they cite the interpretation offered by Schaeffer (1966: 8). This material may in turn be compared with the various forms of the so-called 'dynastic seal', which was copied to preserve the same ideological basis for successive kings. See Nougayrol (1955: xlii and pll. XVI, XVII, §§22-25). The last of these illustrates the anepigraphic tablet RS 16.393A, which has the impressions of both the 'original' seal and of a copy. For further refs. see also Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 178 n. 66). The tricolonic form of the formula used here suggests three stages of blessing, rather than merely a poetic redundancy. Margalit (1989a: 281-82) offers some useful comments on this mythic counterpart of a ritual performed on earth.

'[Take] a wife, O Keret,
take a wife to your house,
bring a [sac]red bride into your dwelling:
she will bear[144] you seven sons[145],
1.15 ii 25 and multiply them eightfold[146] for you.
She will bear Yasib[147] the heir:
he will drink the milk of A[thi]rat;
he will drain[148] the breast of Virgin [Rahmay[149]];
the suckling of [goddesses[150]].

144. Or: 'let her bear', and similarly, with jussives, in following cola. But the indicative is more convincing, since El does not express a wish, but a (divine) promise.

145. Ug. *bnm*. De Moor and Spronk (1982b: 175) translate as 'children', on the ground that there are eight (cf. discussion below on the youngest daughter at KTU 1.15 iii 12). I believe, on the basis of KTU 1.15 iii 24-25, that there are seven sons and seven daughters.

146. This expression suggests that a colon or even two is or are missing from the sequence at KTU 1.15 iii 7-12, which number only six. However, in this n, n +1 example, the seven is the dominant number. Besides, I shall suggest an entirely different explanation of the number of children below, n. 155.

147. On the PN Yasib see Watson (1979b). He explains it on the basis of Akk. *naṣābu*, 'to suck', so that it conforms to the oracle of his birth, 'Suckling', as often with heroes (thus various biblical characters, such as Adam, Abel, Cain, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, his sons, Moses, Samuel [who has stolen Saul's oracle!] etc.). Such literary games are merely the logical extension of all name-giving in ancient societies.

148. Ug. *mṣṣ*. 'He will suckle': del Olmo (1981a: 304). 'Squeezing': Watson (1979b: 807).

149. Most scholars fill the lacuna with *'nt*. Thus Virolleaud (1942–43b: 142, 147), Ginsberg (1946: 23), Bernhardt (1955–56: 111), Gray (1964: 19), del Olmo (1981a: 304), de Moor (1987: 206), Pardee (1997c: 337) etc. There is no warrant for this, in view of the royal ideological myth of the generation of kings: see Wyatt (1996b: 297). The pair to Athirat in KTU 1.23 is Rahmay. The virginal quality (and in my view the term *btlt* in these ideological contexts must mean *virgo intacta*) in the mythic context is part of the fiction that royal goddesses conceive and bear kings as analogues of their earthly analogue, the *rabitu*, who remains ritually pure. It is in effect a transferred epithet. We must not underestimate the pollution which would be associated with sexual activity: Lev. 15 probably merely epitomizes widespread sanctions and taboos throughout the ancient Near East, and in WS societies in particular.

150. Text *mšnq* [ ]. Cf. Virolleaud (1942–43b: 142): *mšnq*[*t*(?)], *CTA*

...'

1.15 iii (about 15 lines missing)[151]

1.15 iii 1 [ ]
'[Be greatly exalted,] Keret,
[among the Saviours of] the underworld[152],
[in the convocation of] the assembly of Ditan[153].

mšnq[ ]. *KTU*[1] m*šnq* [ ], *KTU*[2] mšnqt [ ]. Ginsberg (1946: 23) restored *mšnq*[*t* ilm]. Most have understood something such as 'the (two) wetnurses [of the gods]': thus, e.g., Ginsberg (1946: 23), Gibson (1978: 91), de Moor and Spronk (1982b: 175) and de Moor (1987: 206). For del Olmo (1981a: 304) the wetnurse is sg. My objection to this sense is threefold. First, it supposes that goddesses (exalted beings) act as wetnurses (lowly beings), which is improbable. This is not delegation to a servant, but suckling by the *mother(s)* of her (their) infant. Yasib's mother is geminated on ideological grounds because of the dual nature of kings (Wyatt 1996b: 219-68). Secondly, it places the emphasis on the goddesses, and their connection with Yasib, whereas the passage is about Yasib, and his connection with them. Thirdly, from a prosodic point of view, it requires a reversal of relationships within the tricolon. My translation, following that of Herdner (1974: 539), gives a colon that summarizes the previous two cola. It presupposes a restoration *mšnq*[*ilht*]. Yasib is the heir (*ġlm*) to the throne. Thus is the succession assured, and expressed most powerfully in mythic terms. On the ideological point, that kings are suckled by goddesses, see Watson (1979b: 808 and n. 8), citing Gadd (1948: 45). To this add Frankfort (1948: 44 [Egypt], 300-301 [Mesopotamia]).

151. The missing text probably listed the following six sons of Keret.

152. The status of the *rpum* is much debated. See also KTU 1.20–1.22 and 1.161. For a summary of current views, including the nuances of this passage, see Schmidt (1994: 74-93 [80-81]) and Wyatt (1996b: 352-56). It no doubt anticipates Keret's later (*post mortem*) inclusion among their number, but perhaps also, by way of extreme hyperbole, identifies him even now as one of their number. There may even be a heavy irony, since as the story turns out Keret may just as well be dead! One important feature of the present passage and its ideological meaning, to which Schmidt (1994: 92-130) draws attention is that the first-born son for whom Keret yearns is essential for the due performance of his, Keret's, funeral rites. The description of the ideal son in KTU 1.17 i 25-33 (and parallels) specifies the duties the son will perform on his father's death. It is this son, Yasib, whom Keret subsequently curses, thus frustrating even this basic social obligation.

153. This apparent PN, which recurs in KTU 1.124 and is no doubt to be identified with the *ddn* of KTU 1.161.4, 10, is generally regarded as the eponymous ancestor of the Ugaritic royal line (though this quite probably constituted a fiction). See Schmidt (1994: 72-82, 89-91). See n. 156 below and n. 12 at KTU 1.161.3.

1.15	iii	5	[And she will] come to term and bear you [dau]ghters:
			she will give birth to the girl[154] [ ]
			she will give birth to the girl [ ]
			she will give birth to the gir[l]
1.15	iii	10	she will give birth to the gi[rl]
			she will give birth to the gi[rl]
			she will give birth to the gi[rl][155].

154. Ug. *pġt*. (*UT*, 496 §19.2081). In the Aqhat story this is the name of Aqhat's sister and at Exod. 1.15 that of one of the Hebrew midwives (Puah). The latter context suggests a link with Heb. √*pā'â*, 'groan', as in childbirth in Isa. 42.14.

155. Either each daughter was named in the missing text, or they were numbered off. In KTU 1.16 i 29, 39 the youngest daughter appears to bear the name *ṯtmnt*, which if a name might be rendered 'Octavia', or if a number, 'Eighth'. This at least is the usual view, though the infixed *t* ought to counsel some hesitation. Cf. the Roman practice of naming sons by order (Tertius, Quintus, Sextus, etc.). See Vattioni (1996: 75-77). In KTU 1.15 iii 6 the text reads bn[.]*t* according to *KTU*^{2}. The resultant n. is *bnt* the pl. of *bt*, 'daughter', whose radical *n* is visible in the Ar. form *bint*. The question the interpreter must first answer is whether we have the pl. followed by six daughters, or an anomalous sg., 'daughter' followed by six further ones. For this pattern cf. KTU 1.47.5-11 and parallels (*b'l ṣpn* and six further Baals, totalling seven). In any event this appears to be a heptacolon. Do we therefore have six (named or numbered) daughters, or seven? In either case, there is no explanation for one called 'Eighth'. This should, on this approach, be sought perhaps in the logical demand of the formula n, n + 1 as applied at KTU 1.15 ii 23-24 above (where *bnm* is perhaps to be understood as generic, 'children'). An alternative approach might be to apply the arithmetical pattern of KTU 1.14 i 15-20, so that the first two are implied in the first term (perhaps du. **bnt<m>*?), with the third to the eighth then listed. Note de Moor's (1987: 207) insertion of Thatmanatu in the final lacuna. 'Eighth' or 'Octavia' would in my view—to follow for a moment the logic of the argument—be the last child (of fifteen? fourteen? Cf. KTU 1.15 iii 24-25—see n. 160), rather than the first, in view of the merismic implications of the blessing pronounced upon her at KTU 1.15 iii 16 (*ṣġrthn*, 'the youngest of them [f.]'). Alternatively, the scribe has simply omitted the birth formula twice. In this case two cola are to be restored. Attempts to reconcile modern and ancient arithmetical procedures are frequently futile. Cf. the forty-two(!) generations from Abraham to Jesus in Matt. 1.17, though only forty are given in vv. 2-16, as we would count them.

However, here is a new suggestion for *ṯtmnt*, which solves all the problems outlined above. Apollo has the epithet Σμινθευς, which LS explains as either from TN Σμινθη or from σμινθος, 'mouse'. While the second of these is plausible, on account of his associations with plague, caused by rats, it may already be a secondary interpretation of a Semitic epithet, related to Heb. *ʿmînît*, which has caused

Be greatly exalted, [Keret],
among the Saviours of the underwo[rld],
1.15 iii 15 in the convocation of the assembly of Dita[n][156].
Their last one I shall treat as the firstborn[157].'
The gods blessed him and went away,
the gods went away to their tents,
the family of El to their dwellings.[158]

Bible translators much grief, but probably means 'lyre' (cf. JB 'octachord' at Pss. 6, 12 superscription). Thus Apollo is 'the Lyre-Player', a suitable Semitic epithet for him, especially given his ancient links with Reshef. (His name Apollo is also explicable as a hellenized form of the Semitic aphel form, 'the Feller' sc. the one who fells, √*ypl*, *npl*, as a god of destruction.) Keret's daughter would no doubt, as a princess, be accomplished in social skills. I propose 'lyre-player' as the poet's way of singling her out. The form would be Gt f. sg. pt. The infixed *t* now has an explanation. The girl whiles away her time with her instrument at her hobby (which the French would charmingly call her 'violon d'Ingres'!). She could then be, on a normal arithmetic, the fourteenth child of Keret. It is an epithet rather than a name, but might serve as sobriquet. On its possible social context see n. 209 at KTU 1.16 i 29. The Akk. *sammû*, 'lyre', of Sum. origin (*CAD*, XIV (S), 118-20), which appears at Ugarit would support this approach. See also n. 25 to KTU 1.47.32.

156. See n. 153, and cf. de Moor (1976: 324) and Levine and de Tarragon (1984: 655-56). To de Moor's query, why should a funerary dimension enter the Keret story at this stage, they answer that it is precisely because his present fecundity will make him a blessing to come and a future *Rapiu*. If so, then the irony should not be lost, since Keret is to lose it all at the end. See next note. I think it unlikely in view of the outcome of the Keret story that the king is held up as a paradigm or eponymous ancestor. Quite the contrary! On the other hand, the reference to Ditan here is no doubt the application to Keret, simply as a forceful literary figure, of a name pregnant with ideological power and prestige for the dynasty of Ugarit. Perhaps the irony is the greater because of his prestigious pedigree. On Ditan and Didan see also nn. 12, 21 and 46 at KTU 1.161.

157. In El's mouth this is a blessing indeed, indicating such wealth (= blessing) that there will be no need to divide it proportionally among Keret's offspring. It is however a blessing that will come back to haunt Keret, for it will be transformed by Athirat's malevolence and Keret's stupidity into the curse (KTU 1.16 vi 54-58) with which he disinherits not only his heir Yasib, but by unspoken reference back to this blessing all his other children too. Gray (1964: 19) has 'to the youngest of them I shall give the birth-right', which almost implies the disinheritance of the older children, perhaps anticipating the curse. But such a verbalized contingency plan would be quite implausible, and as I see it the curse will effect them all.

158. An example of staircase parallelism, a:b:c::a1:c1:d1::a2:d2. Though the gods of Ugarit dwelt in temples, the ancient tradition of their tent-dwelling is preserved.

1.15 iii 20 And she came to term[159] and bore him a son,
and she came to term and bore him sons.

Lo, within seven years

the sons of Keret were as (many as) had been promised,
1.15 iii 25 and the daughters of Hurriy as many as they.[160]

And Athirat recalled his vow,
and the goddess [his promise[161]].

And she lifted up her voice and [cried]:

'Look, I pray: has Ke[ret broken],
or [the king] altered his vow?[162]
1.15 iii 30 [So] shall I break [my promise][163]!
...'

(about 7 lines missing)

Cf. the tent-shrine of KTU 1.14 ii [12], iii 55, El's tent-dwelling (KTU 1.4 iv 23-24), the Israelite 'tabernacle' (*miškān*, the term used here in the third colon), the tradition of 2 Sam. 7.6 and Midianite and Egyptian evidence (Wyatt [1996b: 46 n. 57]). The *Chaoskampf* tradition also involves tent-imagery, since the cosmic tent is the stretched out skin of the vanquished Yam. On this see Habel (1972) and Wyatt (1996b: 213-18).

159. Ug. *tqrb*. Similarly Gibson (1978: 92). Driver (1956: 37): 'soon'; cf. de Moor (1987: 207): 'and soon afterwards'. 'She conceives', Ginsberg (1946: 23), followed by del Olmo (1981a: 305) and Herdner (1974: 541). 'She approaches' (Virolleaud 1942–43b: 154) is uninformative.

160. Sc. seven of each, notwithstanding the wording of KTU 1.15 ii 24-25. We should not attempt a realistic approach to the problem of bearing fourteen children in seven years. This is hyperbole, to match the power of El's blessing. Keret outdoes Jacob! Cf. Job's children, Job 1.2 and 42.13 (seven sons, MT [*šib'ānâ* is odd—see Sarna (1957: 18)], LXX; fourteen, T).

161. Ginsberg (1946: 23, 41) suggested the reading *p[lih]*, a conjecture based on Lev. 22.21 and parallels.

162. Thus, e.g., Ginsberg (1946: 23-24), restoring *ypr* in l. 28, Driver (1956: 39), restoring *pr*, Gray (1964: 20) and del Olmo (1981a: 304). De Moor and Spronk (1982b: 177), cf. de Moor (1987: 208): '(Look here, alas, Kirtu, nobleman ([*ṯ*])!)| Woe! two (*tn*) vow[s you have broken...]'. Why two? Cf. Margalit (1995: 242-45). His objection to restoration of *ypr* on grounds of space in the lacuna (cf. Driver) still allows him to propose *ṯ*.

163. Margalit (1995: 243): 'S[o] shall [I] annul [his happiness]', which lacks the reciprocity of expression we would expect.

1.15 iv (about 5 lines missing)

1.15 iv 1 ...[164]
[Then Keret the votary[165] lifted up his voice;]
aloud [to his wife he cried][166]:
'[Hea]rken, [O maiden[167] Hurriy],
slaughter [the sleekest of] your fatlings;
1.15 iv 5 open [ampho]ras of wine.
Call my seventy commanders,
my eighty leaders[168],

164. The line begins *p'*, the rest being broken (cf. Virolleaud 1942–43b: 157, *p* [ ]; followed by *CTA*; *KTU*[1 and 2] ×). A colour slide shows that nothing can now be made of the vague markings surviving. Ginsberg's cautious reconstruction *p'*[nh lhdm ytpd], '[His] fe[et upon the footstool he sets]' (1946: 24, 42), on the basis of KTU 1.4 iv 29, is accepted by Driver (1956: 38-39), Gray (1964: 20, 61) and Gibson (1981: 92). Gray notes that this is a royal motif. Cf. KTU 1.17 ii 10-11, where Danel also does it.

165. If Ginsberg's reconstruction of l. 1 (previous note) be adopted, this would read merely 'he...', assuming that the king had been named in the preceding lines now entirely missing.

166. De Moor and Spronk (1982b: 177) followed by de Moor (1987: 208), take this to be addressed to Keret (by Athirat?), on the ground that he is instructed to command the preparation of his funeral feast (the royal equivalent of digging one's own grave!). This is not implausible, since it appears to be at this same feast that his courtiers begin to lament his imminent death at the beginning of KTU 1.16 i. But in view of the number of missing lines between the tail-off of KTU 1.15 iii and that later point (a rough estimate of ninety-four lines) certainty about the juncture at which Keret's fate is announced and made clear to all is impossible to determine.

167. The fact that Keret continues to call his wife *mṯt* after her marriage and child-bearing illustrates the translational problem. We need a term covering both her premarital state and the present situation, which is also in keeping with *mṯ* at KTU 1.5 v 22. I would defend 'maiden' here on the ground that it reflects what might be regarded as Hurriy's 'honorific virginity' as a queen: her children have a divine father (Keret son of El). She therefore remains ideologically 'virginal', having 'not known a man'. This is in keeping with the famous LXX translation of *'almâ* in Isa. 7.14 by παρθενος. This is not simply an interpretation of the text, but a faithful reflection of its ideological content. Cf. n. 75 at KTU 1.17 v 16. Dantiy is a wife throughout the narrative, so far as we know, but I have used the same translation. It is more a matter of atmosphere than of philological exactitude which determines the issue. Cf. Maid Marion in the Robin Hood traditions.

168. 'Commanders...leaders': the Ug. terms *ṯr(m)*, *ṣbym* (here *ẓby*) mean

the commanders of Khabur abounding in rain,
of well-watered Khabur.

1.15 iv 10 [ ]
[ ]
[ ]
[ ][169]
Let the maiden [H]urriy obey[170].

1.15 iv 15 Let her slaughter the sleekest of his[171] [fat]lings;
let her open amphoras of wine.

To him his commanders let her bring,
to him let her bring his leaders,
the commanders of Khabur abounding in rain,

1.15 iv 20 of well-watered Khabur.

To the house of Keret let them come,
to the dwelling [let them walk],
and to the winevat[172] let them draw near.

'bulls...gazelles', animal terms used for military ranks. We might say 'generals and colonels'. See Miller (1970). Cf. also the use of *ḫnzrm*: n. 37 at KTU 1.5 iv 9.

169. De Moor and Spronk (1982b: 178), de Moor (1987: 208) and Margalit (1995: 245-48) attempt reconstructions of these lines, in which a few sporadic letters survive. For de Moor they concern instructions for the preparation of a meal, For Margalit, instructions to Hurriy to make herself up for the feast, including the donning of her corset! I do not read of any remains of female underwear in the excavation reports.

170. For de Moor (1987: 208) this is future: 'The Lady Hariya will obey', being part of Keret's instructions. Others treat it as narrative (e.g. Gray [1964: 20]: 'Mistress *Ḥry* hearkened'). If taken thus it implies a substantial repetition of the narrative at the beginning of col. v. On this basis I concur with de Moor, that this is part of Keret's instructions. The 3 f. jussive and 3 f. indic. forms of the vbs cannot be distinguished, and the latter may have future or past reference. This is also true of the 3 m. pl. vbs.

171. Or, 'her'.

172. Reading *wlḫmr*. Virolleaud (1942–43b: 157), *wl ḫmt g*(?)*r*. *CTA wlḫm* m*r*. *KTU*[1] w lḫm m*(?)r*. *KTU*[2] *w l ḫm mr*. On Virolleaud's reading and sense: Ginsberg (1946: 24, 42): '*pavilion*'; so also Gray (1964: 20); del Olmo (1981a: 306, 552): 'guest-pavilion'; Xella (1982: 170): 'rooms'. On *CTA-KTU* reading: Gordon (1949: 76): 'tents *of myrrh*', (1977: 48, untranslated, as Herdner [1974: 544]); Driver (1956: 39): 'audience-chamber(?)'; Gibson (1978: 93): 'audience chamber' (reading *ḫmmr*, based on parallelism); de Moor (1987: 206): 'tent of bitterness'. Margalit (1995: 249) interprets the passage as an allusion to a *marziḥu* feast, for which there is no evidence here. I have taken the *m* as dittograph: read **wlḫm{m}r*.

Their hand to the drinking-bowl let them stretch out;
1.15 iv 25 the knife into the meat let them put.[173]
[And] let the maiden Hurriy speak[174]:
"[To ea]t and drink I have called you,
[to banquet[175] with] Keret your lord.
..."'

(about 15 lines missing)

1.15 v (2 lines missing)

1.15 v 1 [She slaughtered the sleek]est of [his fatlings],
she ope[ned ampho]ras of [wine],
to him [his] commanders [she brou]ght[176]
to [him] she [brou]ght [his] lea[ders].

I take *ḫmr* to mean not 'new wine', as de Moor (1971a: 75, cf. Grabbe 1976: 61), but the container in which it is stored. See n. 9 at KTU 1.3 i 16 and Dahood (1964: 408-409; 1972: 186 §II 199).

173. The verbal sequence here is *tbun*, (form of *aṯr*? or *atw*? [cf. *CTA*, 70 n. 7]), *tqdm*, *tšlḥ*, *tštn*. (Cf. at KTU 1.15 v 5-8 below: [*tbun*], [cf. as before], [*tqdm*], *t*[*šl*]*ḥ*, *tštn*.) Taking them to be 3 m. pl. forms, the final *-n* on the first and last instances points to indicatives, suitable for the text below, but less so here, if we expect a jussive force. The central vbs (we can speak only of the latter two) look like jussives, suitable here, but not below. Taken alternatively as 2 m. pl. forms yields the same results. Taken as 3 f. sg., (cf. Gray 1964: 20) the *-n* forms would be energic, the others indicative or jussive.

174. Gray (1964: 20) takes as narrative.

175. The term *dbḥ* usually restored here. But it has the sense 'feast' rather than 'sacrifice', as at KTU 1.16 i 39-40 (see n. 222).

176. Reading [tš']rb (Rom.) with *KTU*^{2}. This section appears broadly to reiterate the reading of iv 15-25, with the omission of the three cola of ll.19-21. This might be restored as an unintentional omission (read '<...>'), but hardly read among the surviving characters of v 6-7. Thus del Olmo (1981a: 307) takes ll. 3-4 to contain the Khabur bicolon. Ginsberg reads the [ ]*r*b which *KTU*^{2} reads at the end of l. 3 ([*tš'*]*r*b, 'she brought') to be [*k*]*rpn* (*sic*), as parallel to *rḫbt* in previous colon (thus also Gibson 1978: 93). But this word-pair does not appear in Ug., the standard one being *ks* || *krpn*, as in KTU 1.15 ii 16-17. The same problem undermines Margalit's (1995: 250) reconstruction. It must be admitted that any reconstruction is hypothetical.

1.15 v 5 So[177] [to the house of Keret they came,]
to the dwelling [they walked]
[and to the winevat they drew near].

Their hand to the drinking-bowl they [stretched] out,
[the knife into the] mea[t] they[178] put.

And the maiden Hurriy [spoke]:

1.15 v 10 '[To eat], to drink I have called y[ou],
[ ] bless...

[Over] Keret you must weep[179],
[like] the bellowing of bulls[180]
[as they bewail] the dead you must weep.

1.15 v 15 [ ] and in its midst[181] you will bury [him][182],
[for] he is only a finger's (breadth) from death[183]:
[Ke]ret is joining[184] El.

177. Ug. *aḫr*: lit. 'afterwards', presumably following the sacrifices.

178. Margalit (1995: 251) makes Hurriy the subject of the vbs in these five cola (on which cf. however KTU 1.15 iv 21-25). They can be read either way, as 3 m. pl. or 3 f. sg.: context determines sense. Understanding the precise nuances of mood is difficult. The formal description suggests a ritual context, with due attention paid to orders of precedence. On this basis Hurriy may be considered to outrank the officials, but it is they who respond to a command (l. 10), and approach.

179. Ug. *tbkn*. 2 m. pl. indic. Cf. Herdner (1974: 545 n. g) on the difficulty of the reading. It reads oddly that Hurriy should *instruct* the nobility to weep. But Keret is not yet dead. Perhaps by ordering the royal mourning to begin she hopes to avert the disaster. Gray (1964: 20): 'For *Krt* they wept'.

180. Ug. [ ]*rgm.ṯrm*. In the context, with the reference above (l. 3) to 'commanders' (*ṯrm*), this might be construed as 'the voice of the commanders', or some such form. Cf. Ginsberg's translation (1946: 25) and the inverted commas in Herdner's (1974: 546). The present translation is supported by what seems to be required at KTU 1.15 vi 7 below. Cf. Herdner (1974: 546 and n. h, 548 and n. q).

181. Ug. *blb*. Lit. 'in the heart'. Sc. the palace? The royal burials at Ugarit are under the palace floors. De Moor and Spronk (1982b: 179): 'in your heart' (sc. in emotional anticipation).

182. Margalit (1995: 252-53), reads *w blb.tqb*[*n*], 'but within they cursed him'.

183. Cf. de Moor and Spronk (1982b: 179), for an Akk. equivalent. Cf. Spronk (1986: 153) and de Moor (1987: 210). Lit. 'his fingers grasp death'?

184. Ug. *šrk*. Cf. de Moor and Spronk (1982b: 179), who note that this is an allusion to the apotheosis of a king, rather than a euphemism for death. Cf. n. 216 at KTU 1.16 i 36.

To the going in of the sun Keret will indeed come,
1.15 v 20 to the setting of the sun our master.
And [Ya]sib will reign over us,
and will [succeed[185] Ker]et the votary over us.'
...[186]

(25 lines illegible or missing)

'...
1.15 vi 1 Listen to[ ]
while[187] you eat and drink.[188]'
And the maiden Hurriy spoke[189]:
'To eat, to dri[nk] I have called you,
1.15 vi 5 to sacri[fice] on behalf of Keret your lord'.

185. Conjectural. Cf. Gibson (1978: 94, reading *wy[l]y*): 'he will [replace]'. Del Olmo (1981: 308): 'Then Keret the Magnificent will depart...'. Ginsberg leaves untranslated. De Moor (1987: 210): 'But Kirtu, the nobleman, answered'. Margalit (1995: 257): 'Thereupon de[cla]red [K-r-]t-the-Noble'. Text *y['n]y*: Virolleaud (1942-43b: 169); *CTA* y[-]y; *KTU*[1] y*[']n*y; *KTU*[2] y[']ny. De Moor's and Margalit's sense is perfectly reasonable; I have taken the colon with the preceding to be part of a bicolon, *ymlk* therefore providing the semantic field in which to set y[']ny. The vb can also mean 'be humiliated' (√'*nw*: *DLU*, 84; not recognized by *UT*, *WUS*; cf. BDB, 776 √'*nh* III), which would give a satisfactory antithetical parallelism: 'Yasib will rule | Keret will be laid low (or humbled)'.

186. No coherent sense can be made in the immediate sequel. *KTU*[2]'s reconstruction of the text (cf. de Moor and Spronk 1982b: 180), and de Moor's and Margalit's attempts at translation, clutch at straws.

187. Ug. *'dm*. The *m* is enclitic. *'d* can have the sense of 'while' rather than 'until'. Cf. KTU 1.4 vi 55. This sense is unrecognized by *UT*, 453 §19.1813, *WUS*, 226 §1997. Cf. *DLU*, 71.

188. The vbs may be 2 m. pl. or 3 m. pl., as for Ginsberg (1936a: 25) and de Moor (1987: 210). Gordon's paradigms (*UT*, 154) would require them to be subj. or juss. De Moor and de Olmo (1981: 308) indic.; Ginsberg and Gibson (1978: 94) juss. To first vb, Virolleaud (1942–43: 170): *[tlḫ(?)]m*; cf. Ginsberg; *CTA* <t>*[lḫ]m*; *KTU*[1] l*ḫ*m (tl*h*m); *KTU*[2] <t>lḫ*m*. Margalit (1995: 261-62) reconstructs [dm]*m*, translating 'How long will you drink (my) [bloo]d?' This is certainly inventive.

189. Ug. *t'n*. If the preceding words are also spoken by Hurriy, perhaps 'continued'. But they may be spoken by a messenger on her behalf. Margalit consequently takes the sequel also to be part of the speech.

They came in[190] to Keret;
like the bellowing of b[ulls] were their words[191].
in [their] view Keret [was already dead][192]
[ ][193]

(about 40 missing lines)

1.16 i 1 (Concerning Keret)
'Like dogs shall we howl[194] at your tomb[195],
like whelps at the entrance to your burial chamber?[196]

190. Virolleaud (1942–43b: 170): *i?d?un*, *CTA* tb'u*n*, *KTU*[1] t*b*un, *KTU*[2] tb*un*. Margalit (1995: 261-62) proposes *tbk* ˡ*n*: '(That) you might (also) weep for K-r-t', continuing Hurriy's speech.

191. Similarly Gibson (1978: 94), del Olmo (1981a: 308) and de Moor (1987: 211). Taking *trm* in its secondary sense as Keret's military leaders, Ginsberg (1946: 25) has 'Like the speech of the peer[s] *is their speech*'. Similarly Gray (1964: 20).

192. Following de Moor and Spronk (1982b: 180).

193. On the deteriorating state of the text see *CTA*, 71 n. 15 and Margalit's observation (1995: 260). His reconstruction (pp. 262-63) is intriguing.

194. Ug. *'tq*. This term is usually explained as having the senses 'pass' (thus, e.g., Gibson 1978: 94; cf. de Moor 1987: 211: 'prowl') or 'grow old' (thus, e.g., del Olmo 1981a: 309). Ginsberg (1946: 26), Gray (1964: 22): 'change(d)'. See Pardee (1973) for discussion. I have tentatively followed the suggestion of Margalit (1976: 148), Dietrich and Loretz (1980e: 189-90) and Xella (1982: 172) that it has the sense 'we shall howl' ('howl' because the simile compares the mourners to dogs). The form *lntn* in l. 5 (in the expression *lntn 'tq*) is generally supposed to have the sense of 'mourn' on the basis of the alternative form *lbky 'tq* in KTU 1.16 ii 41. See Gray (1964: 64), following Ginsberg (1946: 26), Gibson (1978: 94 and n. 7), del Olmo (1981a: 309) and de Moor (1987: 211). This approach can only be a guess for √*ntn* in this sense. See discussion in Herdner (1974: 549-50 n. e,). Perhaps *bky* below should be corrected to *lntn*, but this too remains problematic. Herdner notes that the Ug. vb is *ytn*, not *ntn*.

195. Ug. *btk*. Gray (1964: 64) notes that dogs would not normally be allowed within houses in the ancient world. More to the point, they are frequently associated with death (see illustrations and discussion in Pope 1972), suggesting this secondary sense for *bt*. Heb. *bêtî* means 'my tomb' in Gen. 15.2. Cf. also references at Wyatt (1996b: 108). Ginsberg's (1946: 26, 43) proposal, 'aspect', THeb. *bābū'â*, referring to Keret's face, has not found favour.

196. The parallel *bt* requires a similar nuance for the obscure *ḫšt(k)*. See del Olmo (1981a: 554) and references, Xella (1982: 172). Ginsberg (1946: 26, 44): 'joyous countenance' *(ap ḫštk)*, but no etymology offered. See discussion of the bicolon in Herdner (1974: 548 n. c).

Yet father,
how can you possibly die,
1.16 i 5 or will your burial chamber be given over[197] to howling
on the part of[198] women, O my wretched father?[199]

They weep for you, father,
the mountain of Baal, Saphon,
the holy stronghold of Nan[200],
the mighty stronghold,
the citadel of vast expanse.[201]

1.16 i 10 Is Keret then the son of El[202],

197. Text *lntn*. Clearly written, but perhaps error for *ltn*?

198. Ug. *bd* (construed as *b* + *yd*). Ginsberg (1946: 26, 44): 'dirge'; cf. *ybd* at KTU 1.3 i 18; 1.17 vi 31. Cf. Herdner (1974: 550 and n. f), vb: 'will women sing...?'; de Moor (1987: 211), n.: 'dirges of father's wife'. The poem appears to allude to professional mourning women, such as are illustrated in Egyptian BD papyri and on tomb reliefs and paintings. But this still leaves open my translation and those cited here as alternatives.

199. The prosody of this tricolon (?) is obscure. It has the style of a recitative.

200. Text *nny*, and not as previously supposed, *any*. Reading established by Bordreuil (1989). Nan(u) is Anti-Casius, Gk Mt Thronos, the lower southwestern peak of the Jebel el Aqra massif.

201. The pentacolon has the appearance of a set piece, probably liturgical, cited here. Four parts of the mountain appear to be referred to, though only two are named. The sacred mountain itself bewails the death of kings, and its fourfold allusion probably indicates the cardinal points, thus representing a universal mourning. Why is the mountain thus apostrophized at the impending death of a king? Because the cosmic mountain is a symbol not just of divine victory and the divine throne, but of royal victory and the royal throne too, for the king's legitimate power presupposes the divine victory, and the handing to the king of the divine weapons (as attested in Mari text A 1968, for the text of which see Durand 1993) is a ritual whereby he vicariously shares in the divine victory. See Wyatt (1998a) for numerous examples of the language of the *Chaoskampf* as appropriated by kings. This ideological basis is at least one prominent element in the composition of the Baal Cycle of myths in KTU 1.1–1.6. Wherever Keret may have ruled, fictionally or legendarily, the Ugaritic poet applies Ugaritic royal ideology to the narrative.

202. Ug. *bnm il*. The term may be interpreted on two levels. Prosaically, the expression merely means 'a god', the generic use of *bn*. On a mythological level, which applies here, as supported by the poetic parallel *šph ltpn wqdš*, it means 'son of El', a term replete with ideological nuances, and the exact counterpoint of the other expression *ab adm*, 'Father of Man', used of El in KTU 1.14 i 3 and parallels. The two formulae complement each other as defining the king's position mid-way between the divine and human realms. This is an inchoate doctrine of incarnation.

the offspring of the Wise and Holy One[203]?'[204]
He entered[205] into (the presence of) his father:

which persists through the ideology of the IA monarchy in Jerusalem. Readers should divest themselves of an assumption of the absolute gulf between divine and human beings, the product of a long Judaeo-Christian and Islamic tradition. Cult personnel, and particularly kings and queens, occupied intermediate positions.

203. Ug. *qdš*: an epithet of El himself. See n. 78 at KTU 1.2 iii 20.

204. The passage in ll. 9-23 is the key to the ideological significance discerned in Keret by Parker (1977). He sees in these rhetorical questions a serious critique of an old royal ideology of divine kingship, which the premature death of a king would raise as a serious dilemma. In Wyatt (1983a) I suggested that it was the death of Arhalbu which might have raised such issues quite starkly, he being evidently childless (see RS 16.144 and Tsevat 1958). But if this composition owes something to the editorial (as distinct from merely the scribal) hand of Ilimilku (see colophon at KTU 1.16 vi 59), it is possible to see in the narrative an attempt at ideological support for the monarchy as a means of supporting the claims of Niqmad II. On the circumstances of his accession and the ideological thrust of the Baal myths see Wyatt (1998a). If this seems rather contradictory in view of the unavoidably negative aspect of Keret (as argued by Parker), perhaps we should see the story as addressing the circumstances of Niqmad's predecessor, however elliptically, thus falsifying his claims in favour of Niqmad's. It would however be going too far to see directly biographical information here. It is a traditional tale. We simply have insufficient information to test these theories. See further discussion in Wyatt (1997).

205. Correcting text to *y'rb* (adding the two horizontal strokes of the *b*), 'he entered'. Thus Virolleaud (1941b: 113, translating 'he throws himself on his father'), Ginsberg (1946: 26), Herdner (1974: 551), Gibson (1978: 95), del Olmo (1981a: 310), de Moor (1987: 212), *CTA* and *KTU*[1 and 2]. Cf. also KTU 1.16 ii 50-51. Alternatively, reading *y'rṣ*, as tablet: 'was distraught over'. The correction is to be justified on the ground that ll. 1-11 are repeated *verbatim* in ll. 16-22, and the best construction to put on this is an inner deliberation on the part of the speaker in the latter section, or perhaps an instruction by a god. The former of these alternatives makes sense if we suppose that the anonymous son of Keret is Yasib, who thus deliberates in KTU 1.16 vi 25-38. Given that in the latter passage Yasib is promptly cursed by his father for treason as soon as he gives expression to his inner thoughts, we may wonder whether the thoughts here expressed, so detrimental to a royal ideology in Parker's estimation, are not similar inner plottings which invite the condemnation of the reader. Of course, even daring to think such things on the part of the poet allows the rot to set in! However, the narrative sequence suggests that the son in question here is the Ilhu (*ilḥu*, 'Iluha'u'?) who appears for the first time in l. 46. We must assume that he is another brother. He would have already appeared in the missing section at the end of KTU 1.15 vi. Why is he singled out? Is he perhaps the seventh son, who might have had a special significance? It would be plausible to suppose that he was the youngest son, to whom the blessing of KTU

he wept and gnashed his teeth.
He gave forth his voice in weeping:

'In your life, our father, we! rejoiced;
1.16 i 15 in your immortality we took delight.

Like dogs shall we howl at your tomb,
like curs at the entrance of your burial chamber?

Yet, father,
how can you possibly die?

Or will your burial chamber (be given over to) weeping,
to howling on the part of women,
O my wretched father?

1.16 i 20 How can it be said
that Keret is the son of El,
the offspring of the Wise and Holy One?

Or do the gods die,
the offspring of the Wise One not live?'[206]

And Keret the votary replied:

1.16 i 25 'My son, do not weep for me,
do not lament concerning me;

do not exhaust, my son, the wells of your eyes,
the waters[207] of your head with tears[208].

1.15 iii is applied. However, the text there appears to be quite clear that it is a daughter who is the recipient of the blessing.

206. Note how the previous tricolon (ll. 20-22) repeats the thought of the bicolon at ll. 9-11. The format is changed, from direct question to philosophical musing ('how can it be said...?'), and now leads on to the present bicolon in a strikingly climactic manner; this is the serious theological question of the whole sequence, as indicated by Parker. He argues that since the implicit response is that the gods do *not* die, the conclusion the reader is expected to draw is that the king is not therefore a god. My suggestion (Wyatt 1985c) that it is a kind of '*Realtheologie*', acknowledging the negative side of the human condition, regards it as equally revolutionary thought in the LBA. It may be however that we should regard this as rhetorical hyperbole on Ilimilku's part rather than serious questioning of the present theological consensus. See further Wyatt (1997).

207. Text *mḫ*. Gevirtz (1961: 42) proposed reading *my*, 'waters', a suggestion taken up in *KTU*[1 and 2] and followed here, on the basis of the parallel in Jer. 8.23. The Ug. text is haplographic. The prosody of the bicolon supports the amendment, the head being regarded as a reservoir from which tears flow. If the reading of the

Call your sister the lyre-player[209],
1.16 i 30 the daughter of vigorous[210] conception[211].
Let her weep and lament[212] for me without restraint.

tablet be preferred, 'brain' (Akk. *muḫḫu*, Heb. *mōaḥ*). Thus, e.g., Virolleaud (1941b: 116-17), Ginsberg (1946: 26), Herdner (1974: 552) and del Olmo (1981a: 310). Was the brain regarded as this reservoir? The ancients certainly did not appreciate its real function, to judge from its unceremonious disposal in Eg. embalming procedures (Herodotus ii 86). Note also discussion in Xella (1983a).

208. In Jer. 8.23, the parallel adduced by Gevirtz, the tear-reference is perfectly reversed:

Ug. *qr 'nk mỵ! riš* (a:b:c:d): Heb. *rō'šî mayim w^{e}'ênāy m^{e}qôr* (d:c:b:a).

209. See n. 155 at KTU 1.15 iii 12. Margalit (1976: 154-56; 1989: 69; 1995: 264-65) argues that this youngest daughter (whom he takes to be an eighth, 'Octavia') is a *nadītu*-priestess, or 'a nun residing in a cloister away from home'. Were this conjecture to be taken seriously, we should perhaps envisage the unnamed daughter playing her lyre in a temple choir, as Eg. royal women plied their sistra in the temples of Thebes. There is no need to suppose her to be at any distance from her home, however. Being called upon to play a ritual part here, perhaps involving the use of her instrument, would be entirely consistent with this situation. But Margalit (1989a: 154) also wants to treat *nadītu* as parallel to a restored 'bride' at KTU 1.18 i 26-27, which seems dubious. Cf. also n. 36 at KTU 1.3 iii 4.

210. Virolleaud (1941b: 106, 117): *dnn. CTA d(a/n)n*; *KTU*^{1} da*(?)n; *KTU*^{2} *dnn*.

211. Text *ḥmḥh*, to be corrected to *ḥmḥ<mt>h*. I take this to refer back to Hurriy, who was by no means exhausted by carrying fourteen children: her final pregnancy was as healthy and auspicious as the first. A queen, like a king, was the epitome of ideal (and fecund) motherhood. Xella (1982: 173) translates the phrase 'the daughter whose passion is burning', referring to her character rather than her conception. Similarly De Moor (1987: 213). Whether or not they intend a sexual nuance, this is explicitly denied by Margalit (1995: 265-66), with regard to either alternative; he interprets *bt ḥmḥ<mt>h dnn* as 'her house of sanctuary/shelter/circumvallation' + 'strong, mighty' (epithet of the wall). This would however require the reading *bt ḥ<mt>h dnnt*, whichever n. the epithet qualified.

212. That is, Ilhu's sister's mourning will be more effective than his, or perhaps more specifically his will bring misfortune to a father who is still alive. Here the youngest daughter's skill would come into its own, for she could sing elegies to Keret to the accompaniment of her lyre. The psychological power of music was well-known in the ancient world (e.g. 1 Sam. 16.14-23), and it was an important adjunct of the cult. Weeping was also regarded as releasing power, through the passage of a body fluid. This first mention of weeping may signify a release of power to heal Keret (hence the point about the daughter's greater power). The next mention, in ll. 34-35, appears to presuppose his death. In this case it may imply the greater benefit for the welfare of the deceased.

Afterwards you shall speak to your sister[213],
[ ]
Since I know how compassionate your sister is,
let her weep her tears upon the steppe[214],
1.16 i 35 in the heights[215] the issue of her throat.
[ ][216] at the setting[217] of the Great Lady[218] Sun,

213. Ug. *aḫr.al.trgm.laḫtk*. For this approach, the *al* taken as asseverative, cf. del Olmo (1981a: 311). The first word *aḫr* is uncertain (*KTU*[1] a*ḫr*r*, *KTU*[2] aḫr [Rom.]), and could alternatively be read *ġzr* (thus Ginsberg 1946: 26; Gibson 1978: 95). See Virolleaud's transcription (1941b: 106) and *CTA*, 72 and n. 4. De Moor (1987: 213), reading *aḫr* (thus de Moor and Spronk 1987: 94), takes it to mean 'Come back! Do not (yet) talk to your sister!'. Margalit (1995: 266): 'thereafter do not speak to your sister'.

214. Ug. *šdm*. This may conceivably be an echo of the original location of the story in north-central Syria, or a conventional usage, going to a barren place to mourn, possibly to avoid cursing productive land, as *is* done by the distraught Danel. Cf. Jephthah's daughter (Judg 11.37-40). The translation of de Moor and Spronk (1982b: 182) and de Moor (1987: 213), 'let her not (yet) turn on her water-works in the fields' is not only delightfully ambiguous (one thinks of the leaks of a privatized utility!) but turns the image on its head, by anticipating the opposite of what the text says.

215. Ug. *bsmkt*. See Watson (1996a: 77-78) for range of views. He suggests Akk. *sumuktu*, 'loose earth (?), dirt (?)' as a possible cognate.

216. Text [-]*mt*[-]. Ginsberg (1946: 45) relates it to THeb. √*mtn* Hiph., 'wait', followed by Herdner (1974: 553), Gibson (1978: 95) and de Moor (1987: 213). Perhaps less convincingly in the context of the following lines, 'I shall die (sc. **amt*) at the setting of Great Lady Shapsh' (del Olmo 1981a: 311). So also Xella (1982: 173). This approach, if tenable, would imply a correspondence to the formula of a king's death from Egypt: 'King Tuthmosis III went up to heaven; he was united with the sun disk; the body of the god joined him who had made him' (Frankfort 1948: 102). The Ugaritic king was mythologically son of the sun-goddess.

217. Ug. *ṣba*. The precise nuance, of setting rather than rising, appears to be established by KTU 1.15 v 18-19: *'rb* || *ṣbia*, and 1.19 iv 47-48: *ṣbi* || *m'rb*. But it may be neutral, referring to rising or setting, the context supplying the precise nuance. The presence of this root in WS invites a reappraisal of the Heb. DN *yhwh ṣebā'ôt*, perhaps of the deity (an ancient moon-god?) as controlling all *movements* of celestial bodies, rather than simply the bodies themselves seen as an army. Thus perhaps, with the etymological sense of *yhwh* (see n. 51 to KTU 1.1 iv 14) 'the lord of (celestial) movements'.

218. Ug. *rbt*, an ideological title used of Shapsh. Cf. KTU 1.23.54 and n. 49 *ad*

and at the shining[219] of the great luminary[220].
Then[221] say to your sister the lyre-player:
1.16 i 40 "Keret is giving a banquet; [222]
the king is holding a feast".[223]

loc. Its use here indicates that we should translate the expression mythologically, rather than as simply a neutral reference to sunset. It amounts almost to an invocation of the goddess.

219. Ug. *tgh*. √Ug., Heb. *ngh* (the final *h* is consonantal as Heb. dagesh indicates, though a final *h* remains problematic in Ug. [= suffix?]), Akk. *nâgu*, 'shine'. Either a verbal or substantival sense is plausible, the *h* favouring the latter. Del Olmo (1981a: 311): 'absents itself'; cf. de Moor (1987: 213): 'turning in' (sc. setting). For another interpretation see Margalit's comments (1995: 267-68) and his rendering:

> '[Thou shalt] ar[rive] at the cloister of the Great-Šapš,
> Yea, to the retreat of the Great Luminary'.

He understands this to be the convent where the girl dwells.

220. Ug. *nyr rbt*. Since this is distinct from the usual appellative of Shapsh, *nrt ilm špš* (e.g. at KTU 1.4 viii 21), it is perhaps to be construed as the moon. Thus del Olmo (1981a: 311). In the prehistory of the WS cult, the moon-god would have been El himself. Ginsberg (1946: 27), followed by Gray (1964: 23) and Herdner (1974: 553) thinks rather of the stars: 'the light of the myriads'. Gibson (1978: 95) offers a hybrid: 'the illuminator of myriads (of stars)'. Bernhardt (1955–56: 113) and de Moor (1987: 213), seeing synonymous parallelism, translate as 'the great Lamp' (sc. the sun).

221. Lit. 'and'.

222. The colon reads *krtn dbḥ dbḥ*. Originally understood by Virolleaud (1941b: 121) as an instruction to the youngest daughter to sacrifice. Ginsberg's (1946: 27) understanding, '(Our) Keret is making a sacrifice', has been followed by subsequent scholars (e.g. Jirku 1962: 105; Gray 1964: 23; Herdner 1974: 553; Gibson 1978: 95; del Olmo 1981a: 311; Xella 1982: 173; de Moor 1987: 213). We are to understand Keret as being very sick. Does he have a sacrifice performed on his behalf, or does he come from his sickbed to perform it? The latter would raise serious issues of his fitness for ritual activity. Cf. Yasib's objections to his general incapacity in KTU 1.16 vi 31-38. However, the translation surely errs in translating *dbḥ* as 'sacrifice', firstly in view of this cultic problem, and secondly because the parallel term *'šr(t)* denotes a feast. That *dbḥ* can have the same more neutral sense followed here is clear from KTU 1.114.1. Cf. the secular use of *mgt* at KTU 1.16 vi 18, 21. The ending of *krtn* is probably an *-n* formation, or hypocoristic, rather than a suffix (de Moor and Spronk 1982b: 183).

223. I take it that this bicolon is the whole of the message which Ilhu is to deliver. The following ritual instruction is addressed by Keret to Ilhu, not by Ilhu to his sister.

Take your nose[224] in your (left) hand,
your g[or]ge[225] in your right hand,[226]
go,
stand by the door-lintel[227],
bring silver to your lord[228],
1.16 i 45 and gold in plenty as your gift.'[229]

224. The word should be read *apk*, 'nose': thus Virolleaud (1941b: 122). To be preferred to *tpk*, Ginsberg (1946: 27): 'drum', or Herdner (1974: 554): 'tambourine'.

225. Restoring [*b*]*rltk*. For refs. on discussion see *DLU*, 116. Like *npš*, this term often has an abstract sense, such as 'vitality' or 'appetite'. Here scholars understand it in the context of parallel *ap*, indicating the part of the body associated with breathing. Perhaps alternatively 'windpipe' (thus de Moor 1987: 213). I have understood this to be a two-handed gesture. If the formula *yd* || *ymn* is merely rhetorical, *brlt* may mean 'nostrils' (sg. for du.). Watson (1976b: 107, 109) proposes restoring *grgrk* here, 'your branch', though he concedes the reading *-r-tk*.

226. This seems to be a specifically ritual gesture. It is to be distinguished from the gesture of ll. 47-48, which uses a different vocabulary, though this too has been interpreted in accordance with the present passage. Watson (1976b: 109) followed by Gibson (1978: 96 n. 2) links the second passage with Ezek. 8.16-17, though the *zᵉmôrâ* mentioned there seems to me more likely to be an instrument played through the nostril, such as a nose-flute (√*zmr* I) than a mere 'branch' (√*zmr* II), and in any event the second passage is independent. See below.

227. Thus Gibson (1978: 95, 157): Akk. *ṣerru*, Heb. *ṣîr*, Aram. *ṣîrtâ*. Watson (1976b: 107 and n. 7): 'jamb'. This is contextually more likely than 'go and sing a song on the heights' (thus del Olmo 1981a: 311, 616; Xella 1982: 173; de Moor 1987: 213: Akk. *ṣerretu*), unless a part of the temple or palace were to be understood, though cf. n. 214. Ginsberg (1946: 27): '*go, take thy stand by the songstresses*' (italicized as conjectural: the songstresses being mourning women?). Driver (1956: 41): 'go, take thy place (at the head of) the concubines'; similarly Gray (1964: 23): '... among his harem' (Akk. *ṣirritu*, Heb. *ṣârâ*, Ar. *ḍarratu*).

228. Construed by de Moor (1987: 213 n. 83) as the daughter's personal god. The use of the technical term *šqrb* (as at KTU 1.40.[9], 26) could be taken as support for this approach, already proposed by Virolleaud (1941b: 123). Ginsberg (1946: 27), construing the syntax differently, takes it to be Keret. Watson (1976b: 107): 'cause your lord to approach with your plea(?)'.

229. Ug. *bmgnk*. for the translation above cf. the sense 'as a gift' (sc. to the deity) as supposed by Herdner (1974: 554 n. u) and de Moor and Spronk (1982b: 183). There are a number of other possibilities here: *mgn* here may be a title; cf. its use as a divine epithet in Gen. 15.1; Deut. 33.29; Pss. 3.4; 7.11 etc.; and as an epithet of rulers in Ps. 47.10; Hos. 4.18 (if MT retained). On the other hand, the *b* is awkward for the translation adopted, and suggests the alternative 'in your shield',

Thereupon
the hero Ilhu took his spear in his hand,
his lance in his right hand[230]
[and] he came thither in haste.

1.16 i 50 He arrived [lat]er, and it was dark.

His sister had gone out to draw water.

He set his spear at the door-jamb,
he looked out[231] at the gate.

Lo,
she saw her brother[232]:

with the instrumental use of the shield to hold the precious metal. Perhaps a votive offering is to be understood? Cf. Queen Puduhepa's offerings of gold on behalf of her husband Hattusilis (Parker 1989: 72-75). The sense of *mgn* as 'gift' may also refer to votive shields, such as were kept in the sacred precinct at Jerusalem in the 'House of the Forest of Lebanon', on which see discussion in Wyatt (1998a). Cf. Watson (1976b: 107): 'at your entreaty'.

230. 'Spear... lance': Ug. [*m*]*rḫh*... [*g*]*rgrh*. The second term is hardly 'gorge' here (thus Gibson 1978: 96) notwithstanding Heb. *garg*^{e}*rôt*. It must be a term parallel to *mrḥ*. For *grgr* as 'lance' cf. Akk. *gurgurru* (Ginsberg 1946: 45). De Moor (1987: 213) translates both terms ('nostrils... throat', the former presumably √*rḥ*) in accordance with the ritual in ll. 41-42, but Ilhu will be intending to perform this on arrival at the door, though he is overtaken by events. The employment of a complete change in vocabulary, as required in de Moor's translation, is unprecedented. Ug. poetry usually follows earlier formulaic usage slavishly. Cf. discussion in Gray (1964: 69), and see also below, ll. 51-52. Watson (1976b) takes this to be a plant (*eruca sativa*, Akk. *girgirû*, var. *egingīru*), held to the nose in the ritual he discerns here.

231. Lit. 'he put his face out'. His sister, startled at the sudden appearance of his face out of the gloom, drops her jar in surprise. Cf. at KTU 1.17 vi 15, where Anat drops her cup. Bad luck evidently dogs the family here, since the shattering of the water-jar would undoubtedly be understood by Ilhu and his sister as a bad omen. The text remains obscure. De Moor (1987: 214) appears to understand Ilhu hitting his nose on the door (as his sister opened it?—'when her face came out of the gate'). This has also been understood as a third allusion to the ritual of ll. 41-42: e.g. del Olmo (1981a: 312).

232. On Watson's (1976b) understanding, Ilhu is performing his ritual when his sister sees him on her return from water-fetching. He quickly tries to disguise his action as something neutral, but she has already seen what he is up to, and draws the worst conclusion. Watson's reconstruction of the event is persuasive: I differ from him only in seeing not a plant held in the hand, but the ritualist's throat held in the hand, as the pattern of behaviour. Cf. discussion in de Moor (1979: 644-45).

her jar shattered on the ground.

1.16 i 55 [On seeing] her brother she wept:

'[Is] the king [really] sick?
[Is] Keret your lord [in truth ill]?'

[And] the hero Ilhu [replied:]

'The king is [not really] sick;
1.16 i 60 [K]eret your lord is [not in truth ill][233]:

[Keret] is giving a banquet;
[the king] is holding a feast'.

1.16 ii 1 (16 lines illegible)[234]

She approached her brother [Ilhu]

'Why have you lied to me[235] [ ]?
For how many months has he been s[ick],
1.16 ii 20 for how many has Kere[t] been ill?'

And the hero [Ilhu] answered:

'For three months has he been s[ick],
for four has K[eret] been ill.

1.16 ii 25 Certainly Keret is approaching [his setting][236] and the grave[237].'

233. Cf. Ginsberg 1946: 27; Driver 1956: 41; Herdner 1974: 556; del Olmo 1981a: 312.

234. For an attempted reconstruction of this section see Margalit (1995: 272-78).

235. Ug. *lm tb'rn*. Or: 'misled me?'. Variously interpreted: 'why dost thou deceive me': Ginsberg (1946: 28); 'why dost thou keep me in suspense?': Gray (1964: 24); 'why do you lead me?': Herdner (1974: 557); 'why do you put me off?': Gibson (1978: 97); 'why have you abandoned me?': del Olmo (1981a: 313); 'why have you kept me away?': Xella (1982: 174); 'why did you bring me [to our father]?': de Moor (1987: 215); 'why do you fool with me?': Margalit (1995: 278). √*b'r*, 'turn down, disappoint' and other meanings: *UT*, 375 §19.495; 'get rid of': *WUS*, 56 §459; √II, 'abandon': *DLU*, 103 and refs. It can hardly be a question of √*b'r* I, 'burn', undifferentiated in *UT* and *WUS*.

236. Ug. *mġy* [*'rb*]: used of the setting sun, and of going into the grave. Cf. n. 217 above.

237. The entire phrase is *mġy* [*'rb*] *wqbr*. Lit. 'coming to the entrance and the grave'. Perhaps a hendiadys.

She shrieked,
a c[ry she raised][238];
she shrieked,
she raised a screa[m].

Like women beating the gate she wailed[239],
like women in childbirth [she moaned][240].

1.16 ii 30 Altogether naked,[241] without [even her] shift[242] [she went],
mournfully, with no garment.

And [until with her wailing] her brother had had enough
she wept in front of Ilhu.

A [c]ry she raised;
she shrieked,
she raised a [scr]eam.[243]

238. Reading *q*[*l.trm*] with *t*, as at ll. 33-34 rather than *q*[*l.rm*] of de Moor and Spronk (1982b: 185), followed by *KTU*^{2}. The tetracolon of ll. 25-26 is partially repeated as the tricolon of ll. 33-34.

239. De Moor and Spronk (1982b: 186) conjure up a delightful picture of girls meeting their boyfriends at the well, but it is difficult to see how this fits the present image. More likely perhaps is mourning women in a frenzy of grief at the entrance to a tomb.

240. Note the merismus: all life from death to birth (in that order, a reversal of the natural process) is summed up in this woman's cry. The world is turned awry by the death of Keret.

241. Ug. *ʿrym*, adv., lit. 'nakedly'.

242. De Moor and Spronk (1982b: 185) read *lbl* [*.lbšt*] *bṣ*; lit. 'without [(her) garment] of linen (byssos)', which I take to be an undergarment.

243. I have broadly followed the proposal of de Moor and Spronk (1982b: 185-86) for ll. 25-34, though with some modifications. For an entirely different approach see, e.g., Herdner (1974: 557-58), Gibson (1978: 97) and del Olmo (1981a: 313-14). According to these scholars it is a set of instructions given by Ilhu to his sister for the preparation of the grave. This seems inherently improbable on two grounds. Firstly that the daughter should prepare the tomb for her father, the main ritual duties being performed by the eldest son, as shown in KTU 1.17 i 25-28 and parallels, and thus not even Ilhu's responsibility; and secondly that such a concern should intrude at this juncture, where a description of the daughter's distraught state is much more apposite, following directly on her hearing the bleak news. The words to which she gives expression are the same as her brother's in KTU 1.16 i 14-23 (which fulfil the instructions of ll. 2-11). No stiff upper lips in Ugaritic society: like Racinian heroes and heroines, they give full vent to every feeling.

1.16 ii 35 She wept and gnashed her teeth,
she gave forth her voice in weeping:

'In your life, father, we rejoiced;
in your immortality we took delight.

Like dogs shall we howl at you tomb,
like curs at the entrance to your burial chamber?

1.16 ii 40 Yet father,
how can you possibly die?

Or will your burial chamber (be given over) to weeping,
to howling on the part of women,
O my wretched father?

Or do the gods die,
the offspring of the Wise One not live?

1.16 ii 45 They weep for you, father,
the mountain of Baal, Saphon,
the holy stronghold of Nan,
the mighty stro[ng]hold,
the citadel of vast expanse.

Is Keret then the son of [El],
the offspring of the Wise [and Holy One]?'[244]

1.16 ii 50 Weeping she entered[245] in [to her father],
she entered the ro[om of Keret]

(about 7 lines illegible or missing)

1.16 iii (about 30 lines missing)

1.16 iii 1 Oil [of peace]was poured[246] [into[247] a bowl].

244. Ll. 35-49 are identical with elements from KTU 1.16 i 6-23, adapted to Ilhu's sister as subject, and with the units in different order. This is evidence of the practice in oral poetry of treating the sub-units almost as musical phrases, to be recombined in different order in the overall symphony.

245. Ug. *t'rb*. This supports the correction of the text reading *y'rṣ* to *y'rb* at KTU 1.16 i 12 above. See n. 205 *ad loc*.

246. Subject? 'He': most interpreters. Virolleaud (1941b: 198) and Ginsberg (1946: 29): 'they'. It is the same formula as in KTU 1.3 ii 31 and 1.101.14, according to Gibson (1978: 98) and *KTU*^{2}, and I have translated it in the passive in accor-

And he[248] said:
'Explore[249] earth[250] and heaven;
travel to the ends of the earth,
to the edge of the abyss[251].
1.16 iii 5 To the earth let the rain of Baal speak[252],
and to the steppe the rain of the Most High[253]!
Pleasant to the earth (would be) the rain of Baal,
and to the steppe the rain of the Most High!
Pleasant to the wheat in the furrow,
1.16 iii 10 in the ploughed field to the spelt,
like a diadem about the city-mound[254]!'
The ploughmen lifted up their heads,
those preparing the wheat (looked) up.
Exhausted was the bread in their granaries;
1.16 iii 15 exhausted was the wine from their wineskins;

dance with the requirements of the former passage. The restoration of the line is conjectural.

247. Or 'from'.

248. In view of the large number of lines missing before and after the text in col. iii, we can only conjecture the identity of the subject. It may be a god, a priest acting on Keret's behalf, Ilhu, or, following Gibson (1978: 98 n. 1), Gupan and Ugar, the messengers of the similar passage KTU 1.5 vi 3-9. There is certainly a thematic link with the Baal text, since Ilimilku appears to wish to evoke the death of Baal as comparable to that of Keret. It seems likely that the speaker is instructing Gupan and Ugar to make a search. This is at least unconsciously an ideological feature.

249. Ug. *tr*. Cf. Heb. *tûr* and del Olmo (1981a: 638, √I rather than II, 'tremble', as supposed by Gibson 1978: 98).

250. In the formula *arṣ wšmm*, *arṣ* probably has overtones of the underworld. This is a comprehensive search!

251. Cf. Herdner 1974: 560 and n. j; Gibson 1978: 98.

252. 'Let speak': Ug. '*n*. I take this to be a prayer for rain, along the lines of the formula in KTU 1.1 iii 12-16 and parallels. Gibson (1978: 98): 'a source (of blessing)...'. Del Olmo (1981a: 315) takes it with previous words: '...look!'.

253. A title of Baal. See Wyatt (1992a: 419).

254. I understand this to be an image of a city crowned by its surrounding fertile fields. Thus also Herdner (1974: 561 and n. n), del Olmo (1981a: 315). To *'ṭrṭrt* (to be explained either as dittog. or redupl.) cf. Heb. *'aṭārâ*. Other views: Gray (1964: 25): 'over the furrow-ridges as incense'; de Moor (1987: 217): 'like fragrant herbs on the ridge'.

exhausted was the oil from [their] v[ats].[255]
The house of Keret [ ]

(about 18 lines missing)

1.16 iv (about 16 lines missing)

'...

1.16 iv 1 [[256]] El, listen!
Like El your speech [is wise],
like Bull the Wis[e One] you are wise:[257]
Summon the herald[258] of the god(s)[259], Ilsh,

255. Since Athirat's curse lies heavy on the king, it affects every aspect of life in his kingdom. Famine threatens all his subjects when the king is punished for his sins. His impending death presages universal death. The thought here is closely parallel to the very practical conception of divine blessing and curse in Deut. 28.1-6 || 15-19. The Ugaritic and biblical sources point to the moral rationalization of natural disasters: someone has to be blamed!

256. Margalit (1995: 290-91) plausibly conjectures the reading *lmlak* here, 'O messenger of (El)', denoting Kothar.

257. De Moor and Spronk (1982b: 187) have these lines addressed to someone else who is compared to El. They suppose Baal. Merrill (1968: 16) thinks it is Keret. I think it is more probably Kothar, in conformity with Margalit's suggestion. While Baal appears to intercede before El on Danel's behalf in KTU 1.17 i 16-33, he is not a god who acts merely as intermediary for others. There appears to be a hierarchical relationship, El addressing lower orders of deity through intermediaries. It may also be that Ilsh is an artificer-god (see next note) which would strengthen the likelihood that Kothar, chief of craftsmen, should be instructed to deal directly with him.

258. Ug. *ngr* (Akk. *nāgiru*). Thus Driver (1956: 43 n. 8), Herdner (1974: 562; see n. t), del Olmo (1981a: 316, 587) and Margalit (1995: 291). Alternatively we should follow Virolleaud (1941c: 207), Ginsberg (1946: 29) and Driver (1956: 43): 'carpenter-god' (Akk. *naggâru*, Ar. *najjar*). Cf. Gibson (1978: 99): 'steward' (n. 2: 'or "carpenter"'). Gray (1964: 26, 73): 'water-pourer' (Heb. *nāgar*, Punic *ngr*). The broken state of the text prevents us from making any certain choice between these options, but l. 16 below (*gm ṣḥ*) may be regarded as circumstantial evidence in support of the line taken here. Since Ilsh (and his wife) appear nowhere else, it is impossible to be sure what their function is in the narrative. De Moor (1987: 218 n. 96) and Korpel (1990: 292), followed by Becking (1995a), argue that the primary meaning of *ngr* (f. *ngrt*) is 'raven', and secondarily 'messenger'.

259. Ug. *ngr il*. This may mean simply 'divine herald (or carpenter, or raven)', but I take its f. form following, *ngrt ilht*, to be cs. with gen. pl., which must there-

Ilsh <the herald of the house of Baal,>[260]
and his wife, the herald of the [go]ddesses.'

1.16 iv 5 Like a wild ass[261] off sped[262] [Kothar.]

He summoned the herald of the god(s), Ilsh,
Ilsh the herald of the house of Baal,
and his wife the herald of the goddesses,

(saying:)

1.16 iv 10 'Thus says[263] the Wise One, the perceptive god:

"Listen[264], O herald of the god(s), Il[sh],
Ilsh the herald of the house of Baal,
and your wife the herald of the goddesses,

go up to the parapet of the building,
to the top of the tower[265],

fore influence the sense here. Since *il* is parallel to *ilht*, it ought to be given a pl. sense, though the pl. *m* ending is obstinately absent.

260. Restored on basis of ll. 7 and 11, as suggested to me by Wilfred Watson: a haplography has been caused by the double reference to Ilsh.

261. Text *km'r*. The word *m'r* is unknown. Aistleitner (1964: 102), followed by Margalit (1995: 291-92) and myself, divides *km 'r*, which in Herdner's view (1974: 563 n. w) 'ill fitted the context'. But the wild ass was a figure of unrestrained vigour, to say nothing of lechery, to the ancients. Cf. Ishmael's epithet 'Onager-Man'. Margalit has in mind Hephaistos' crippled state, so that 'when he (Kothar) runs, he resembles a galloping donkey rather than a horse'. I think this misses the point, which is speed, not clumsiness.

262. Ug. *khṣ*. Most leave untranslated. Aistleitner (1964: 102; *WUS*, 147 §1300): 'rush off (like a wild ass)' (comparing, tentatively, Ar. *kaḥaṣa*); followed by Margalit (1995: 291-92).

263. Ug. *ky'n*. Cf. Heb. *kōh 'āmar*.

264. The term *šm'* also carries the nuance 'obey'.

265. Ug. *ln.ḫnpt.mšpy*. *KTU*[2] brackets the first word-divider: '[.]'. The preceding colon suggests the sense required, on the basis of parallelism. For *ln.ḫnpt* cf. Ginsberg (1946: 29): 'platform...' Driver (1956: 45): 'parapet(?)' (followed by Gibson 1978: 99; Xella 1982: 176). Gray (1964: 26, 73): 'to the summit of the bare roof' (Ar. *ḫanā*, 'to swell' and *nafata* 'to be tall', cf. Heb. *nôp*). Herdner (1974: 563 n. y): 'summit' (Ar. *ḫanif*: 'proud'). Del Olmo (1981: 317, 589, citing Ar. *ḫanafa*, *aḫnafu*) translates 'back, spine'. For *mšpy*, Gray cites Heb. *šᵉpî*, 'bare height' (√*šāpâ*, also cited by Herdner and del Olmo). An entirely different approach is taken by de Moor and Spronk (1982b: 188): 'croak, announcer (three times) to the defiled earth', addressed to the putative raven-messenger. The form *nḫnpt* is explained as N f. pt. of *ḫnp*, 'defile' and *mšpy* by ref. to Akk. *mušāpû*, 'announcer'.

1.16 iv 15 the three (of you) like the waters of a fall,[266]
to the mountain[267] call aloud
[ ]
...'''

(about 27 lines missing)

1.16 v (ll. 1-9 illegible)[268]

1.16 v 10 And the Wise One, [the perceptive god, asked]:
'[Who] among the gods [will remove the sickness],
will expel the di[sease]?'
[But none from among the gods] answered him.
He asked the question a se[cond, a third time]:
1.16 v 15 'Who among [the gods will remove] the sickness,
will expel [the disease]?'
But none from among the gods ans[wered him].
He asked the question [a fourth,] a fifth time:
'Wh[o among the gods] will remove[269] the sickness,
will ex[pel the disease?'
But none from among the gods answered [him].
1.16 v 20 He asked the question a sixth, a seventh time:

This seems strained in comparison to the alternative, though it does of course relate to the following text.

266. Tentative translation partly based on the suggestion of Margalit (1995: 292-93). I take the *tlṯ* to be part of El's instruction, here relayed by Kothar to Ilsh and his wife, to all three of them, Kothar included, to proclaim his message. The instruction it is intended that Kothar should pass on (to two heralds) has come to include himself (a third). *kmm* I construe as *k* + *m m* (or the second *m* may be enclitic), while *ṯrry* is to be related to the epithetal *ṯrrt* in KTU 1.14 iii 5 n. 80).

267. The mountain (sc. Saphon) is the dwelling-place of the gods. The message is to be shouted out so that all may hear.

268. Ll. 8-9, beginning respectively *ṯnnth*[...], *tlṯth*[...], may allude back to Keret's vow to Athirat (cf. KTU 1.14 iv 42-43, where however the first term is *ṯnh*). De Moor and Spronk (1982: 189), taking this line, are of the view that Baal probably offers to pay Keret's debt. But contrast Ginsberg (1946: 30): 'a second time... a third time...'.

269. Ug. *ydy*. The nuance is that of exorcism. See n. 1 to KTU 1.169.1.

'[Who] among the gods will remove the sickness,
will expel the disease?'[270]

But none from among the gods answered him.

And the Wise One, the perceptive god, said:

'Sit, my sons, on your seats[271],
1.16 v 25 on the thrones of your princeships.

I myself shall act the craftsman,
and I shall create,
I shall create[272] a remover of sickness,
an expeller of disease!'

With m[ud his hand] he filled,
with suitable mud [his right hand].[273]

270. This is the classic motif of the chief god seeking a volunteer to perform a task, which finds an expression in Isa. 6 and 40. The sevenfold request to the gods gives them the fullest opportunity to answer El's invitation. Seven represents totality (seven children, a seven-day journey, seven days of siege, the twice sevenfold blessing of El, leading to seven sons and seven daughters, and perhaps further sets of seven in missing passages). The breaking of the seven days of the journey into sets of three and four, breaking the flow of Keret's obedience to El's instruction, further symbolizes the breaking of the vow itself which has now culminated in the need for El to act unilaterally. See n. 121 to KTU 1.14 iv 45. The completion of the journey at that juncture on the fourth day is itself a satisfying conclusion, but ironical in view of its disruption of the more important seven-day pattern. The purpose here is to highlight El's rejoinder to the silent gods; for he alone is able to act effectively to help Keret. This is a function of El's special relationship with a king. See Parker (1977; cf. 1989: 190-91, where he cites the parallel of the myth of Zu). Whether or not the missing text spoke of El's awareness that it is Athirat's curse that is at work, we cannot say. On the 'sevenfold' motif cf. KTU 1.4 vi 22-35 (Baal's temple built in seven days: cf. 1 Kgs 6.38; 8.65), 1.6 ii 31-35, v 12-19 (Anat's treatment of Mot), 1.12 ii 42-45 (seven-year drought), 1.17 i 5-16 (Danel's ritual activity), 1.19 i 42-43 (a seven-year curse), iv 13-18 (seven years of mourning for Aqhat), 1.23.66-68 (seven years of wandering for the gracious gods) and 1.41.53 (seventh day marks end of ritual sequence).

271. Or: 'return to your dwellings' (thus de Moor 1987: 219). Herdner (1974: 565) hedges: 'go and sit down' (cf. n. d).

272. The form *ašḫn* occurs twice. Possibly dittographic, or one should be corrected to {*a*}*šḫn*, to read as inf. abs. 'I shall indeed create...'. The vb is presumably Š of √*kwn*. The G stem would suffice were the sexual sense intended.

273. Reading from a colour slide, the text of this putative bicolon in ll. 28-29 may be read very tentatively as follows:

1.16 v 30 He fashioned [ ] out of moistened clay[274].
[ ] dragon[275],

(some 7 illegible lines)

'...
a cup [ ]
1.16 v 40 a gob[let]

(ll. 41-48 consist only of odd letters)

[remove] the sickness,
1.16 v 50 [expel] the disease!'

(10 further illegible lines)

'...
1.16 vi 1 Mot it is who will be destroyed,

rṯ/ḥt? [---] *ymlu*
n'm.rṯ [----]

This may be compared with the readings of *CTA* (*r*[----].*ymlu* | n'*m* (k/r)*ṯ* [---?]), which differs from Virolleaud's (1941c: 210) transcription only in allowing the possible k in l. 29 and increasing the estimated gap in the first colon; and *KTU*[1] r×[ ].ymlu | n'm.r*ṯ [ ], *KTU*[2] *r*ḥt[h].*ymlu* | *n'm.rṯ.ṯ*[iṯ]. All references to hands (**yd* parallel **ymn*) are reconstructive, though entirely reasonable. I construe the material used (*rṯ* || *n'm rṯ*) to mean 'mud... the best of mud' or the like. On *rṯ* see *WUS*, 297-98 §2556. 'Clay': Ginsberg (1946: 48) and Herdner (1974: 566). Del Olmo (1981: 626) cites Ar. *rawṯu*, *raṯṯa* and Akk. *rušu*.

274. Text *yqrṣ dt.bpḫ*[----] *mḫṯ*. The first term, as Ginsberg (1946: 48) pointed out, is used of the making of Enkidu by Aruru (*Gilgamesh* 1.2.34); Gray (1964: 74) and Gibson (1978: 100 n. 5) noted the same usage in Job 33.6. The form *pḫ*[*r*] is understood by de Moor (1979: 647-48) to mean 'potter' (Akk. *paḫāru*): *idem*, (1987: 220, for *dt.pḫ*[*r*]): 'such as is used by the potter'. Margalit (1979: 553 n. 51) cites Akk. *paḫaru*, Aram. *paḫra*, Ar. *faḫḫar*, 'clay': 'a being (he creates) from clay'. The final *mḫṯ* remains obscure. Perhaps, by haplography, corrupted from **mṯṯ*, 'watered, moistened'?

275. The reading *tnn* is tentative. Perhaps Shatiqat is serpentine, a suitable symbolic form for a healing goddess, the dangerous quality of snakes (see KTU 1.100, 1.107) having homeopathic significance. On snake-goddesses see West (1995: 132-38). Cf. also the royal formula u š u m . g a l, 'Great Snake', used by Shalmaneser III (*ANET*, 276 and n. 2: Oppenheim compares this with the Eg. uraeus, who as the goddess Wadjet on the king's brow symbolizes his effective power in the world).

Shatiqat[276] it is who will prevail!'[277]

And Shatiqat departed;
she came indeed[278] to the house of Keret.

Weeping, she entered[279],
1.16 vi 5 sobbing[280], she came within[281].

From the city she cast out Mot,
from the town she cast out the Enemy[282];
with a staff she struck him:

<the sickness> came out of his temple[283],

276. The name is the 3 f. sg. form of the Š stem of √*'tq*, 'she causes to be distant', or 'she removes'. As with the names of Baal's maces, *ygrš* and *aymr*, the finite form of the name conveys greater immediacy than a pt. form.

277. This presumably ends El's instructions to Shatiqat. This final bicolon may be read as jussive: 'Let Mot ... Let Shatiqat ...!'. On the scene cf. Saliba(1972).

278. Inf. abs.

279. Ug. *tgly wtbu*. I am inclined to treat the *tbu* as dittographic (from l. 3; cf. l. 5), or the whole expression as hendiadys.

280. 'Weeping ... sobbing': Ug. *bkt ... nṣrt*. Ginsberg (1946: 31) appears to treat these as TNs, perhaps denoting Keret's palace. The second term is explained by Driver (1956: 157 n. 9) with ref. to Ar. *ṣarra*, *ṣarṣara*, 'cried out, yelled', and by del Olmo (1981a: 592) with ref. to Common Semitic *nṣr*. See rather Heb. *ṣrr*, hiph. denom., 'suffer distress', though no niph. is found. Cf. Gray (1964: 74-75); Herdner (1974: 568 n. m); Healey (1976: 432); Sanmartín (1978: 451).

281. Construing *pnm* as equivalent to Heb. *p'nîmâ* (Herdner 1974: 569 [end of n. m]).

282. Cf. the approach of del Olmo (1981a: 320) and Xella (1982: 177). That of Ginsberg (1946: 31), 'towns she flies *over a hundred* | villages she flies *over a multitude*' (his italics, as conjectural), followed with variations in detail by Driver (1956: 45), Jirku (1962: 113), Herdner (1974: 569) and Aistleitner (1964: 103), makes no sense immediately after we have heard that she has entered Keret's palace. On a different approach again de Moor (1979: 646; cf. 1987: 221): 'in the town she made her incantation/charm fly | in/through the city she made her flower-stalk fly'. 'Mot ... the Enemy': reading **mt* in l. 6. Cf. Virolleaud (1942–43a: 1-2). A colour slide makes it quite clear that this is the reading, despite the efforts of *CTA* (*m*h), de Moor (1979: 646: *m*<*nt*>*h*) and *KTU*[1 and 2] (mh* [erasure] ××; *m*h [××]). There is certainly evidence of an erasure and rewriting, but we should read what the scribe ended with, rather than what he began with! On my approach, *tdu* is construed as √*nda* (del Olmo 1981a: 588), cf. Heb. *nādā'*, rather than as √*day*, while to *šrr* || *mt* cf. Heb. *šōrēr*, Ar. *šarra* (del Olmo 1981a: 633).

283. 'Temple' or 'temples' (du.). The term is *ptm* (not to be corrected to *km* as in *KTU*[2]; cf. *CTA*'s trouble with the text), since *pt* is || *riš*. It is to be linked to Akk.

the illness[284] from the top of his head.

1.16 vi 10 And she sat down and washed him free of sweat.

His appetite for food she opened,
his desire for dining.

It was Mot who was destroyed;
Shatiqat it was who prevailed over him.

1.16 vi 15 So Keret the votary gave an order;
he lifted up his voice and cried:

'Listen, O maiden Hurriy—

Slaughter a lamb that I may eat,
a young animal[285] that I may feed!'

The maiden Hurriy obeyed.

1.16 vi 20 She slaughtered a lamb and <he> ate,
a young animal and he fed.

Lo,
a day and a second,
Keret sat upon his throne-dais,
the king sat upon his throne,
against his back-rest,
on the siege of his dominion.

1.16 vi 25 Now Yasib was sitting in the palace,
and his inward parts[286] instructed him:

putu, Heb. **pōt* appearing in Ps. 19.8. For discussion see Wyatt (1995b: 572, 589-90), following a suggestion of Dahood (1965: 123). To be distinguished from *pit* = Heb. *pē'â* (KTU 1.17 ii 9).

284. 'Sickness...illness': the former term (*mrṣ*) is restored following the suggestion of Gibson (1978: 101). The word-pair *mrṣ* || *zbln* already appears six times above in KTU 1.16 v 10-50.

285. The term is *mgt*. Cf. perhaps Heb. *muggaš* (Mal. 1.11), which means 'offering' (*nāgaš*, hoph. pt.). However, this sense would be inappropriate here. Cf. the non-cultic nuance of *dbḥ* in such passages as KTU 1.16 i 39-40. See discussion in Virolleaud (1942–43a: 9) and del Olmo (1981a: 574). Bernhardt (1955–56: 115): 'kid'.

286. Is this expression perhaps intended to indicate that these are bad thoughts, perhaps even thoughts in bad faith? Jaynes (1976) represents the thought of what he calls 'Iliadic man' as internal dialogue experienced as the voices of gods. If Yasib listens to his own 'inward parts' instead of to divine voices, he is ill-counselled. I

'Go to your father, Yasib,
go [to] your [fa]ther and say,
repeat [to Keret your lord]:

1.16 vi 30 "Listen,
and let your ear be alert:

[Like a warrior] can you command [warriors],
and [give orders to those under (your) command]?[287]

you have lowered your hand in weakness[288].

You have not tried the case of the widow;
you have not judged the cause of the powerless.[289]

1.16 vi 35 Like a bedfellow is illness,
(your) concubine is disease!

Step down from your kingship:
I shall be king;
from your dominion:
I shall be enthroned!"'[290]

Yasib the heir went away.
1.16 vi 40 He came in to his father.

He lifted up his voice and cried:

thank Richard Clark for this suggestion. (Alternatively, this internal self-conscious dialogue is evidence against a Jaynesian psychology.)

287. Bicolon restored on basis of ll. 43-44. See other comments below.

288. The raised right hand (the weapon-hand) of a king is a symbol of his power, here compromised by the lowering of the hand. Some biblical examples of the motif of the 'hand of power' are Exod. 14.16, 26; 17.8-16 (Moses) and Exod. 15.6, 32.11; Deut. 4.34 (Yahweh). On this motif see L'Orange (1953) and recent discussion in Wyatt (1998a). See also at KTU 1.3 v 23 and n. 70, and 1.18 i 10 and n. 124.

289. The classic social duties of the king, still maintained in the rhetoric of modern governments. Isa. 1.17, one of many biblical allusions to the theme, appeals for the implementing of the basic ethos, sadly neglected (1.23). Widows and orphans are those in society who have no champion to protect their interests. The king is their last court of appeal for justice.

290. On the presumption of Keret's continuing sickness, Yasib's motive is beyond reproach. A sick king cannot rule effectively: he should give way to someone who can. However, we know what he does not, that Keret has now been healed. So Keret's incapacity for wise judgment exhibited in his neglected vow is now visited upon his son, who, failing to check his facts before blurting out his challenge, calls forth the curse which will undo all El's patient work.

'Listen, I pray, O Keret the votary[291],
listen, and let your ear be alert!

Like a warrior can you command warriors[292],
and give orders to those under your command[293]?[294]

291. Are we perhaps to discern in Yasib's form of address a distancing of himself from his father, whom he now seeks to depose and supplant? The reference to his epithetal *ṯr* (see n. 115 at KTU 1.14 iv 37) can only rub salt into the wound. And while this direct form of address is typical of discourse between the gods, it smacks of impudence when a king is thus addressed by a subordinate, even though he be his own son.

292. Ug. *kġz.ġzm*. While leaving untranslated, Virolleaud (1942–43a: 13) explains as parallel to *ġrm*, 'mountains', and thus misconstrues. Ginsberg (1946: 32) leaves the entire bicolon untranslated. Bernhardt (1955–56: 115): 'as someone whom anger excites (you speak ...)'; Driver (1956: 47): 'as when raiders(?) make a raid(?)', Gibson (1978: 101): 'while bandits raid you turn your back' (Ar. *ġazâ*, 'raid' [vb], *ġazwu*, 'raid' [n.]); cf. Aistleitner (1964: 104): 'while you give in to the most wicked men of violence' (*WUS*, 246-47 §2137: 'extortioner' [Ar. *ġazâ*]); del Olmo (1981a: 322, broadly followed above, and also by Xella [1982: 179]), gives the more neutral sense 'warrior' for *ġz*, and sees here a martial role for the king. Herdner (1974: 571-72 and n. y) entirely reverses the sense: 'in case of invasion, you flee'. Gray (1964: 29, 77): 'by slow degrees thou art growing old' (Ar. *ġadġada*, 'diminish', *dabara*, 'recede [or possibly "grow old"]': Ug. lit. 'thou art receding by slow degrees'). De Moor (1987: 222): 'the most munificent you drive away'. In view of such diversity, it is as well to recognize the provisional nature of the translation. On *tdbr* see *UT*, 384 §19.641 ('manage'). *DLU*, 128 distinguishes two forms, √ I, 'guide, cause to march', and √ II, 'to say, declare'. Either makes sense here. See also discussion in Watson (1996a).

293. Ug. *w ġrm.ṯtwy*. Bernhardt (1955–56: 115): 'and you are like a slanderer' (Ar. *sawiya*, 'to be like'); Driver (1956: 47, 152 n. 15): 'and shalt dwell in the pit' (Ar. *ṯawâ*, inhabit', Heb. *šiwwâ*, 'quieted'); Herdner (1974: 572 and n. *z*): 'and you take refuge in the mountains' (Ar. *ṯawaya*, 'sojourn, stop'); Aistleitner (1964: 104): 'you entertain swindlers'; Gibson (1978: 102, 155, 160): 'and you entertain feuding rivals' (Ar. *'atwâ*[*y*], 'entertained'; *ġr* [√*ġyr*], 'rival'). De Moor (1987: 222): 'but the usurer you allow to stay'. Del Olmo (1981: 322), broadly followed by Xella (1982: 179) has 'and to troops (can you) give orders?'. To the difficult *ġr*(*m*) cf. Heb. *ṣar*, 'foe' and *ṣîr*, 'envoy', each of which might also fit the present context. To *ṯtwy* (*UT*, 501 §19.2662: 'rule, govern') cf. Heb. √*šāwâ* II. Cf. also Gen. 14.17 which glosses *šāwê* as *melek*.

294. I have taken the bicolon to refer to Keret's failure to fulfil his military duties. This approach is supported by the following monocolon of ll. 44-45, which also has a military reference. Those other translations noted above which preserve this sense are inherently more plausible than entirely different approaches.

1.16 vi 45 You have lowered your hand in weakness!
You have not tried the case of the widow,
you have not judged the cause of the powerless!
You have not banished those who plunder the child of the poor:
you do not feed the orphan in your presence,
1.16 vi 50 while the widow is behind your back![295]
Like a bedfellow is illness,
(your) concubine is disease!
Step down from your kingship:
I shall be king;
From your dominion:
I shall be enthroned!'
But Keret the votary[296] replied:
1.16 vi 55 'May Horon smash, O my son,
may Horon smash your head,
Athtart-the-name-of-Baal your skull!
May you fall down in the prime of life,
empty-handed, and humiliated!'[297]
The scribe is Ilumilku the sacrificer.[298]

295. Out of sight, out of mind! The expression points to a more powerful ideological presumption, that to catch the king's eye is to have legitimate expectation of satisfaction from him. The orphan's lot here is worse, however, for even *within* the king's presence (*lpnk*, l. 48) he is neglected.

296. As the dénouement unfolds, we are reminded again, with a final irony, that Keret is under the obligation of a vow.

297. The curse is that uttered against Yam by Baal in KTU 1.2 i 7-9. It is evidently a routine curse of destruction. Perhaps its *Sitz im Leben* was executions? This could provide a neat exculpation for the executioner: he merely fulfilled a god's command. Keret's unthinking outburst against his son, heir to his throne, at once unravels all the repair work laboriously achieved by El to undo the outworking of Athirat's curse, which had brought Keret to the point of death. Now her vengeance is complete, as Keret himself obligingly voices the very curse the goddess must have had in mind. Now, at a stroke, he is back to square one, with no heir to his throne. In view of the blessing on his youngest daughter in KTU 1.15 iii 16, that she would have the blessing of the first-born, we must suppose the colon to have been pregnant with future omen, for now it transpires that logic demands that she also share in the curse now pronounced. Implicitly, *all* the children are cursed.

Even had Athirat's wrath been deflected by appropriate ritual means, El would presumably have caught up eventually with Keret for his initial disobedience (at KTU 1.14 iv 36-43). The last word of the text is *wt'n*, 'and be humbled' (√*'ny* II). Virolleaud (1942–43a: 19) took this to mean 'and she replied' (√*'ny* I), thus introducing a speech by Keret's wife or daughter. This is perhaps the origin of the theory of another tablet (next note). The conclusion of Keret is not to be construed as evidence of the theological bankruptcy of Ugaritic religion, as has been supposed by some commentators (e.g. Oldenburg 1969; de Moor 1990). Rather is this evidence of the vitality of LBA society. For my more extended views on this see Wyatt (1996b: 323-30; 1999b). The pluralistic symbolism should not be understood as detracting from this, for it is precisely the idiom in which the diversity and conflict of experience are explored. Lévi-Strauss' famous conclusion (1977: 216) on the nature of myth is worth reiterating here, even if Keret be regarded as not belonging to this genre, and if we do not wish to press the entire structuralist agenda:

> although the problem obviously cannot be solved ... myth provides a kind of logical tool which relates the original problem ... to the derivative problem ... Although experience contradicts theory, social life validates cosmology by its similarity of structure. Hence cosmology is true.

This is no less valid than the hermeneutical circle of theology, for all theology is an attempt to treat the most fundamental human problems through a metaphysical game of suspended disbelief. It is perhaps worth noting too that a work of literature may be exploring the unknown, thinking the unthinkable, and intuiting extensions of experience (which is what theology is all about). It is wise not to take it too literally as supporting a prejudice, as is sometimes done to its disadvantage in modern studies of Ugaritic religion. Margalit's (1989a: 46) characterization of the end of Keret as almost light-hearted ('[it] ends on a note of levity') and as lacking any tragic dimension in my view misreads the text. It is tragic precisely in that it studies the consequences of a flaw in human character—Keret's levity in matters of religion—which is not dissimilar to Aqhat's lack of propriety before a goddess.

298. The colophon is an abbreviated version of the fuller one found at KTU 1.6 vi 54-58. I understand this to be the end of the Keret story. See also del Olmo (1981a: 243, 273, with references: 243 n. 14 to dissent from this view), and Margalit (1995: 314-15). Cf. Parker (1989: 145) for a recent reiteration of the 'incomplete' theory, and also de Moor (1990: 93 n. 275), who argues that the final tablet would have had the fuller list of Ilimilku's titles we see in KTU 1.6 vi. This argument is spurious in my view, since we have only one such example, which is scarcely enough to warrant stating it as a principle. If the story really ends with the effective reimposition of the accursed position in which he first found himself, there also seems little justification for maintaining the view that Keret is to be seen as the eponymous ancestor of the Ugaritic royal dynastic line. It may be an unwritten supposition that the story must somehow have borne a positive message for the Ugaritic dynasty which leads to the expectation of a fourth tablet. But apart from Parker's intriguing view of the text as a serious critique of traditional royal ideol-

ogy, it is possible to see the story as deliberately discrediting one king in order to legitimize his successor, who bears no blood relationship to him. We know insufficient about the succession of the kings of Ugarit to be certain about matters of this sort, but it is a reasonable estimate that the sequences found in such texts as KTU 1.113 and 1.161 do not necessarily vouch for a line of direct descent between successive kings, particularly over the many centuries required for the former text, but do attest a line of 'ideological descent'. To be 'N son of N' is to be in a legal, and not necessarily a filial relationship with one's 'father'. Even the apparent continuity of the Judahite monarchy may include some fictitious relationships, for genealogies were essentially manipulative constructions, designed to accord legitimacy. Every king is 'son' to his predecessor unless he repudiates the link. The supposition of a dynastic shift, in which Niqmad II (now revised to Niqmad III-IV: see 146 n. 132) required to be legitimized by appeals to the old ideology which showed him as the natural choice of the gods can also steer us away from the ultra-satirical position adopted by Margalit (1999). In favour of such an approach is its presence in the Baal Cycle of myths (Wyatt 1998a), where the element of continuity throughout the cycle is the one throne which persists in spite of the multiple changes in occupancy (Wyatt 1996c). In the Keret story what is at issue is the tension between the perfectly serious presentation of all the old ideological forms and the obtuseness of Keret's own behaviour. Central to the narrative, the pivot about which all revolves, is the vow to Athirat, the goddess who is primarily concerned as *rabitu* with matters of royal procreation and succession. It is not the institution which fails here, but the incumbent. Perhaps here too is a subtle message concerning the assumption of office by Niqmad II. He will succeed where his predecessor failed because he will fulfil all vows, obligations and righteousness. But see now 146 n. 132

Part IV
KTU 1.17–1.19

THE STORY OF AQHAT*

(KTU 1.17 = CTA 17 = II D = 2 Aqht = RS 2.[004])
(KTU 1.18 = CTA 18 = III D = 3 Aqht = RS 3.340)
(KTU 1.19 = CTA 19 = 1 D = 1 Aqht = RS 3.322 + 3.349 + 3.366)

Select Bibliography

Virolleaud 1936d; Gaster 1936, 1937b, 1938; Ginsberg 1945a, 1945b, 1969*: 149-55; Gordon 1949*: 84-103, 1977*: 9-29; Gaster 1950*: 257-313; 1961*: 316-76; Fronzaroli 1955; Driver 1956*: 48-67; Jirku 1962*: 115-36; Aistleitner 1964*: 65-82; Caquot and Sznycer 1974*: 401-58; Dijkstra and de Moor 1975; Dressler 1975, 1979, 1983; Clear 1976*: 50-69; Watson 1976c; Xella 1976, 1982*: 193-216; Coogan 1978*: 27-47; Gibson 1975, 1978*: 103-22; Dijkstra 1979; Margalit 1981, 1983b, 1984c, 1989a*; del Olmo 1981a*: 327-401, 1984: 115-42; Caquot 1985, 1987, 1990; Parker 1987, 1989: 99-144; de Moor 1987*: 224-66, 1988b; Cooper 1988; Aitken 1990*; Husser 1995, 1996; Pardee 1997c*: 343-56; Parker 1997: 49-80*; Aboud 1998;Wyatt 1999a; D.P. Wright 2001 (* indicates comprehensive translation.)

This traditional tale is in some respects analogous to the Keret story, in that it treats the same theme of childlessness (in this case, perhaps specifically of sonlessness, since it is concerned with the role of the [eldest] son with regard to ritual and social duties towards his father), and like Keret, faces the dilemma of the loss of so important an asset.

* 'Aqhat' has become the conventional designation of this narrative poem. Virolleaud (1936d) named it after Danel, Aqhat's father. This original view has something to be said for it, though Ilimilku also identified it as 'Aqhat' (KTU 1.19 i 1). In terms of the tragic dimension, Aqhat is the appropriate counterpart to Yasib, but the story as a whole appears to be concerned with broader issues than Aqhat's death: Danel too is also the counter to Keret, though an innocent one. The lost ending precludes a final estimation.

In both cases the importance of the theme is emphasized by its reference to a king, for such a problem is then of importance to the whole society. I do not think the matter of Danel's royal status is in dispute, despite claims to the contrary, and have drawn attention to the (admittedly circumstantial) evidence in the notes.

The same debate has taken place on the strict literary category into which the text falls as with the Keret story. Astour (1967) has seen broad mythic elements in the narrative, taking Aqhat to be the prototype of the Gk hero Actaeon, while de Moor (1988b) has discerned seasonal elements analogous to those he believes to be present in the Baal myths and the Keret story. For a useful study of the genres, antecedents and congeners of the story see Parker (1987). Both the Keret and Aqhat stories are primitive forms of the later tragic genre: Keret's weakness lies in carelessness and a short memory. Whether Danel has a flaw in his character we cannot now say, since any description of it is now missing. But the sons of both heroes are also at fault. As Yasib sins by insulting his father, and bringing his wrath down on him, so Aqhat sins by insulting a goddess, whose vengeance is sure and terrible. These are in short typical human situations, in which reality and ideal are all too often at some remove.

Contrary to Margalit (1989a: 253) who sees the Aqhat story as 'a powerful critique of this same society and its cultural values', and de Moor (1990: 69-100 [93-97]), who writes of 'the pantheon of disillusion', so that both commentators see Ugaritic culture under judgment,[1] it seems to me that it simply presupposes the ethos of such a society and its normal preoccupations with fertile families and land. This is by and large the ethos of Genesis. The confrontation between Aqhat and Anat is the inevitable consequence of the character of the two. They merely play out the logical implications of their personalities, and neither is under any implicit judgment, any more than is the world in which they live. Indeed Aqhat gives a superficial impression of a very modern young man, standing up for his autonomy and integrity. He is

1. It seems that Ugarit and its culture is extraordinarily and irrationally prone to judgmental posturing of this sort by modern scholars. The only clear reason I can discern for this is the preconceptions of certain kinds of modern theology, which perhaps, sensing a threat when comparisons are made with ancient Israelite-Judahite religion, feel obliged to defend the latter *à la Deutéronome* by a sustained offensive against the former. At the end of the twentieth century it would be nice to think that we had outgrown such a prejudicial approach. It is quite inappropriate to an academic discipline.

just rather too blunt in making his point. Anat's particular form of flesh-devouring savagery is a graphic image of war personified. Her character as a huntress here, especially in KTU 1.18 iv 3 and 1.19 i 1-19, is to be compared with the imagery of her as a war-goddess in KTU 1.3 ii 3-30, for the two activities are closely related, especially in royal ideology. But there is nothing inherently ideological in the poem, even in the light of the hunting dimension, for the themes are universal, though the probability of its redaction by Ilimilku, who seems to have had his own motivation in transmitting the Baal Cycle and Keret, suggests the application of a similar concern with the royal legitimacy of Niqmad II (cf. Xella 1976). This is nevertheless essentially a folk-tale which takes for granted the prevailing world-view of its time of transmission. Some scholars suppose that a tablet preceding KTU 1.17 may be missing, while a fourth missing tablet, or possibly one or all of KTU 1.20–1.22, are sometimes regarded as the continuation of the narrative at the end.

Synopsis of the Narrative

1.17 i Danel (is without a son and therefore performs a ritual to obtain divine assistance; he) sacrifices to the gods for six days, perhaps spending every night in the temple. Baal intercedes for him on the seventh, asking El to provide a son who will perform all the filial duties. El blesses Danel and promises...

ii a son. [The son is born and news is brought to Danel,] who rejoices and holds a feast in his palace for the goddesses of childbirth.

iii ————

iv ————

v Kothar arrives with a composite bow as a gift. He is fêted, and the bow is given to Aqhat...

vi A feast is taking place. Anat asks Aqhat for the bow. He tells her to take the raw materials to Kothar, who will make her one. She persists, offering him immortality. He tells her to stop lying, and says that, in any case, a bow is a man's weapon. She goes off to El in a rage, accusing Aqhat of impiety.

1.18[2] i Anat threatens El if she does not get her way; he gives her a free hand. She comes to Aqhat, inviting him to go hunting with her.

ii ———————

iii ———————

iv Following a successful hunt, Anat summons Yatipan, and tells him to assume the form of a falcon, and pounce on Aqhat, killing him. He does so...

1.19 i The bow falls into the river and is smashed. Anat immediately laments what she has done. Danel sits to dispense justice; Pughat sees the withering of the plants and tears Danel's cloak. He utters a curse.

ii Danel, apparently not taking in the whole story, which of course the reader knows, wishes that his son would harvest the now shrivelling grain. Two messengers arrive and tell of Anat's complicity. Danel...

iii curses the falcons. As each falls from the sky he examines its stomach (or crop). Empty falcons are healed. Finally he finds his son in Sumul's stomach, and buries him. He then goes round the country,

iv cursing all villages in the neighbourhood of the murder. Aqhat is mourned for seven years. Pughat puts on armour, with a woman's gown over it, and sets off to find Yatipan. He thinks she is Anat, demands wine, and boasts of his exploit while she plies him with it...

2. Virolleaud (1936d: 217-27) estimated KTU 1.18 as having had six columns. He took cols. i and iv to be vi and i respectively. See also discussion at n. 136 to KTU 1.18 ii on Margalit's view.

1.17 i (about 10 lines missing)[3]

'...

1.17 i 1 [Then[4] let Danel, the man of heal]ing,
at once let the hero, [the devotee of *Hrnm*][5],

3. A previous tablet may also be missing, according to Margalit (1989a: 250-51). There is some circumstantial support for this, for ten lines is scarcely enough space for an Ugaritic poet to reach the stage in the narrative as it begins in l. 1. There are just too many presuppositions which the reader requires, such as, did Danel have previous children who died? Had his wife died, like Keret's, with perhaps a second marriage already consummated, but proving barren? If the opening lines are instructions (see n. 9) who issued them and against what background?

4. The presence of the formulaic introduction [*apnk*]...*aph*<*n*> leads Husser (1996: 85) to suppose that a self-contained unit (cols. i and ii down to l. 27) begins at this point.

5. Danel carries the double epithet *mt rpi*...*mt hrnmy*. What do they mean? The term *mt*, ('man') is usually construed in the sense of owing allegiance to, or in a religious sense, being a devotee of a deity, on the supposition that *rpi* (nom. *rpu*) and *hrnm* are DNs. The latter is also construed as a TN, so that *mt* TN means 'citizen of TN'. The most obvious candidate for the former is Rapiu, the god hymned in KTU 1.108, who appears to be the eponym of the *rpum* (cf. Heb. *r*^{e}*pā'îm*) who feature in KTU 1.20–1.22 and KTU 1.161. See Parker (1972), de Moor (1976) and Rouillard (1995). Typical of other translations: Driver (1956: 49): 'Rephaite... *hrnmy*-man'; Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 419): 'man of healing... man of Harnam' (with explanation: 402, that the latter 'probably reveals the name of his capital'); cf. Jirku (1962: 116); Gibson (1978: 103): 'man of Rapiu...man of He-of-Harnam'; de Moor (1987: 225 and nn. 5, 6): 'the Saviour's man...the Harnamite man' (explained n. 5, as Danel being a special protégé of Baal, and n. 6, Harnam being perhaps Hermil on the Orontes, with other views and refs. given). The treatment of *hrnmy* as gentilic goes back to Albright (1953). Virolleaud and del Olmo leave untranslated. Margalit (1989a: 143, 251-60): 'the Rapian... devotee of the "Rainmaker" ', (with survey of opinions, and rejection of the theological sense of *rpi* and the gentilic sense of *hrnmy*). Margalit takes *rpi* to be a TN—with *mt rpi* as gentilic—ident. with modern er-Rafeh in the Hauran (Raphon of 1 Macc. 5.37, Eg. TN *nw.rpi*; cf. G.A. Smith 1931: 629 n. 1). Thus the term has for him the sense of 'man of Rapiu (TN)', a position forced on him by his refusal (1989: 253 etc.) to accept that Danel is a king. As for *hrnmy*, he construes this as a DN, made up from √*hr*(*r*), 'be full, pour out, dispense' and *my*, 'water', thus 'dispenser of waters', 'Rainmaker'. I find Margalit's broad arguments more compelling than previous ones, especially in view of the cultic associations of *hrnmy* in KTU 1.19 iv 24, 31. The whole issue is now to be revised in the light of Annus 1999, who convincingly relates *mt rpi* with Greek *meropes anthrôpoi*. I am not convinced by the etymology offered for *hrnmy* (it takes no account of the *-n-*) in the second, so that I take it to

enrobed[6], feed the gods,
[enrobed], give[7] the holy ones[8] [to drink].

be an unexplained theological term, perhaps an epithet or a DN **hrnm*. Might such a (minor) god be associated above all with incense? See below at KTU 1.19 iv 24-25. Note that I adapt the nuance of *mt* to each context: 'ruler... devotee...'. I have written the TN 'Rapha' instead of 'Rapiu' (DN) for clarity. Dressler (1979: 211) also rejects a royal dimension for Danel. It must be conceded that certainty eludes us on the term *mt rpi*. I have fulfilled the translator's duty of choosing an option here. Given that I accept Danel's royal status, the possible anticipation of his future status as one of the *rpum* cannot be ruled out. Cf. n. 152 to KTU 1.15 iii 4.

6. Ug. *uzr*. Taken as G pass. pt. The garments Danel wears (*ṣt*, *mizrt*), presumably a ritual one appropriate to the occasion and an undergarment, are mentioned in ll. [4-5,] 13-15. For this approach see Aistleitner (1964: 67: 'in mourning-clothes'), del Olmo (1981a: 367: 'girt'), Xella (1982: 193: 'ritually clothed'). Hardly 'in loincloth' with Margalit (1989a: 143), 'clothed in a loincloth' (Husser 1996: 88), as this would be quite inappropriate for a ritual occasion. (Wilfred Watson points out to me that Sum. priests were portrayed as 'ritually naked' during the cult, but we may not assume that this was the case in Ugarit.) Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 172-73), followed by de Moor (1987: 225 n. 7), reject this sense in favour of some cultic term appropriate to solid and liquid offerings ('consecrated oblations'), comparing it with Ph. *'zr* = *'zr*. Cf. Gibson (1978: 102 n. 1). See already Driver (1956: 49 and n. 2): 'nectar(?)', Jirku (1962: 115-16): '*uzr*-offering', Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 419 and n. c): 'stimulant'. *UT*, 354 §19.125 (√*'zr* II): 'food or drink offerings'; *WUS*, 10-11 §130a as above; *DLU* (p. 67) lists various options. A case can be made for either approach. On the garment approach cf. the following (all refs. Yon 1991): the long ceremonial robe with thick hem worn by the king, and illustrated several times, e.g., on the Baal au Foudre stela (p. 331, RS 4.427) and on the terracotta stands (e.g. p. 332 §e, RS 78.41 + 81.3659). This probably represents a specific type of garment worn in cultic contexts. Cf. also the robe of the enthroned El statue found in 1989 (pp. 117 §2, 337 §17b: RS 88.70) as well as the gilded bronze statuette (p. 337 §17a, RS 23.394) and perhaps on the stela (p. 336 §16a, RS 8.295).

7. See Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 173) on √*šqy* as causative in the G-stem. The parallel term *lḥm* has the same causative sense. Cf. Pardee (1997c: 343 n. 2). The view of Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 419) that Danel eats and drinks 'divine stimulants' is untenable with regard to the form of the vbs. Cf. also Aistleitner (1964: 67) who has 'the god ate...the son of *Qdš* drank', identifying these terms with Danel. The only obvious use of 'stimulants' is wine and various incenses. On the other hand an enquiry into the religious use of plant substances and other narcotics in ancient Ugarit could prove very interesting. Cf. n. 50 to KTU 1.14 ii 19.

8. Ug. *bn qdš*. Lit. 'sons of the Holy One' (sc. El): cf. *bn ilm*, 'gods'; alterna-

Let him take off [his robe, go up] and lie down.
1.17 i 5 take off [his clothes] and go to bed.'[9]

Lo,
a day [and a second],
[enrobed, the gods] Danel,
[enrobed, the gods] he fed,
enrobed, [he gave] the holy one[s to drink].

A third, a fourth day,
[enrobed, the go]ds Danel,
1.17 i 10 enrobed, [the gods he] fed,
enrobed, he gave the [holy] ones to drink.

[A fi]fth, a sixth day,
enrobed, [the go]ds Danel,
enrobed, the gods he fed,
[enrobed] he gave the holy ones to drink.

[Dan]el took off his robe[10];
he took off his robe, went up and lay down,
1.17 i 15 he took off his clothes[11] and went to bed.[12]

tively, 'sons of holiness (abstract)'. But not 'sons of Qudshu (goddess)'. See n. 78 at KTU 1.2 iii 20.

9. I am inclined to endorse the approach of Jirku (1962: 115), followed by Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 419-20) who have this passage read as a set of instructions, which Danel then obeys in ll. 5-15. The only problem is stylistic: do the forms *apnk* || *aphn* belong within direct speech? Others treat the vbs as indicatives, and the passage as narrative. The latter approach raises the problem of this initial account being followed by the seven-day account that follows, an unlikely repetition, even by the standards of Ugaritic prolixity. In that there is an imbalance between the apparent simplicity of the instruction (to be performed once?—or is it possible that reference to a six-day sequence was contained in the original text?) and the complexity of its fulfilment (performed over six days), the whole point is probably that Danel's desperation for a son leads him to an obsessive performance of the rites. This lends verisimilitude, in that it highlights the anguish of a childless king. Cf. Keret's emotional state in KTU 1.14 i 26-30.

10. Ug. *ṣth*. Cf. Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 174): Akk. (*ā*)*ṣītu*, Ar. *ṣuttiyah*. They also compare Heb. *sût*, 'vesture' (with samekh).

11. Ug. *mizrt*. Or: 'loincloth'. Cf. Pardee (1997c: 343 n. 3).

12. The entire ritual episode has been widely interpreted as an incubation procedure (see especially Obermann 1946). Margalit (1989a: 77, 250, 260-66) and Husser (1994: 29-62; 1996: 93-95) offer systematic critiques of the theory, concluding that there is no instance of it in Ugaritic literature. Note the difference in

Behold[13],
on the seventh day[14],
Baal drew near[15] in intercession[16] for him,
at the misery[17] of [Da]nel, the man of healing,

the character of Keret and Danel as described by Ilimilku. Keret sobs himself to sleep at his unhappy lot. Danel is more pragmatic, and performs a ritual to achieve his end. There may of course be a description of Danel's state of mind in earlier missing text. Keret has also lost his wife; Danel has a wife, who appears later (l. 39) and is subsequently (KTU 1.17 v 16) identified as 'Maiden Dantiy', so that the rituals performed may be construed as traditional medicine, intended to effect a conception.

13. Ug. *nik*. Introduces the seventh day, a new departure from the preceding six-day sequence. Similarly at KTU 1.17 ii 39.

14. The repetitious use of seven-day periods and other examples of the use of sevenfold structures were noted at KTU 1.16 v 20-21 n. 270. The narrative appears to indicate that Danel offered sacrifices and libations for six days (not seven, as proposed by Margalit 1989a: 266) before going to bed. If so, this probably corresponds to no normal ritual (there is no intrinsic reason, for instance, to link it with the seven days of KTU 1.41.47), but is a literary hyperbole, as the formal use of the n, n + 1 enumeration indicates (the seven is the climax, the favourable time when so much piety can *only* be efficacious), to express the degree of his dedication and self-sacrifice in pursuit of the most noble of ends, obtaining posterity. There was no question of free choice about having children: it was a solemn duty. The literary form also serves to show his importunity, which finally achieves its result when Baal intercedes for him.

15. Baal draws near not to Danel, but to El, before whom he intercedes for Danel. This is not a theophany. Thus we are to understand the events of this scene to take place in El's home. I have taken this to be located on Mt Saphon ('Mount Throne', KTU 1.1 iii 12, is apparently to be located on Saphon l. [16]), though in an earlier recension some sacred locality of the Hauran may have been intended, such as Mt Hermon or Jebel Druze. I suppose that Ilimilku has at any rate made the transfer in his own mind, even if there is nothing specific in the text. This supports the interpretation of the opening lines as instructions (now that he has obeyed them it is time for Baal to act, perhaps reminding El of a promise?), and lends some circumstantial support to the view that there was an earlier tablet, now missing, which narrated events preceding Danel's present childless condition. Certainly the estimated ten lines missing at the beginning of this tablet could hardly have given much in the way of introduction to the present complex state of affairs.

16. On the precise nuance of *ḥnt* see Watts (1989).

17. Text *abynt* (Virolleaud 1936d: 186 and pl. V). *CTA* reads final 'nt' in Rom. *KTU*[1 and 2] read '*abyn* at'. For this reading see Dietrich and Loretz (1978b: 67). The signs following the clear *aby* are entirely unclear. There may even be three signs, a third being perhaps discernible on the double vertical line separating the columns.

the groaning of the hero, the devotee of *Hrnm*,

who had no son like his brothers,
nor scion like his kinsmen[18]![19]

1.17 i 20 'Because[20] having no son like[21] his brothers,
nor scion like his kinsmen,

enrobed, the gods he feeds,
enrobed, he gives the holy ones to drink,

you must surely bless him, Bull El my father,

There are vertical elements as clear as the horizontal ones, yet none are as deeply impressed as other letters in the vicinity. Most take a practical line, recognizing in the uncertain writing either *abyn* or *abynt*; thus Virolleaud (1936d: 191): 'abstract from *'ebyôn* [*sic*]'; Gibson (1978: 103 and n. 5, 141): 'the misery' (MHeb. *'ebyônût*, 'poverty'). Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 420 and n. i): 'my father...' (reading only *aby* with certainty); Del Olmo (1981a: 368): 'How wretched you are', cf. also Xella (1982: 194), Aitken (1990: 29 and n. 4) presupposing *abyn at*. Margalit (1989a: 144, 267) takes *abyn* as an epithet applying to El: 'a deliberately rhymed and ironic imitation of El's stereotyped epithet *ltpn*'. This seems rather speculative. His translation: 'art thou indifferent...', construes this as the beginning of Baal's speech.

18. There appears to be a macho dimension here. Danel presumably is to be imagined as comparing himself unfavourably to other men, even if we concede Margalit's (1989: 254-55) view that it was generally women who were blamed for failure to conceive. The very matter of blame says it all! If Danel is in addition a king, the matter is even more serious, since his virility (or lack of it) would be full of portent for the nation. And the nation goes on results. This theme is comparable to that of the Keret story.

19. There is no certainty as to the whereabouts of the beginning of Baal's speech. Some scholars incorporate these two bicola as the beginning, addressed either to El or Danel (cf. n. 15). I take Baal's words to begin in l. 20 (with *bl*), following Driver (1956: 49) and Jirku (1962: 116). (Their line-numbering follows Virolleaud and *CTA*, mine that of *KTU*.) The latter position is more convincing, since otherwise Baal indulges in a gratuitous repetition.

20. Ug. *bl*. Normally taken as a negative or positive particle (see, e.g., del Olmo 1981a: 527, with refs.). It must here be construed with the following *it*. Gibson (1978: 104 n. 1) cites Heb. *'ên yēš* in 1 Sam. 21.9 and Ps. 135.17. Virolleaud (1936d: 188) appears to think that Danel already has a son! No sooner prayed for than granted?

21. Text *wm*. usually corrected to *km*, but better $k^{l}\{m\}$ (*k*...*km*... being a standard word-pair).

you must surely give a blessing to him[22], O Creator-
of-creatures,

1.17 i 25 so that he may beget[23] a son in his house,
a scion in the midst of his palace.
He shall set up[24] the stela[25] of his ancestral god[26], [I]

22. Ug. *tbrknn...tmrnn*. For the same vbs (*tbrk* || *tmr*) see KTU 1.15 ii 14-15 and n. 141.

23. Ug. *ykn*. √*kwn* in its sexual sense: 'beget' rather than 'establish', though the latter sense is possible. Cf. KTU 1.23.54, Ps. 8.4 and Wyatt (1996b: 227 n. 29, 242). Margalit (1989a: 144) takes the latter sense in the pass.: 'that a son may be established'. There follows the list of the classic six duties of filial piety (enumerated as [I-VI] for ease of reference in discussion). It is striking that only six are listed. We would not be surprised to encounter seven, and I suggest that the present bicolon, introducing the six, constitutes the seventh element of our implicit expectation, so that the result is the sevenfold perfection of the production ([I]) of a son who will fulfil all righteousness ([II-VII]).

24. Ug. *nṣb*. These and the other verbal forms (apart from *mšṣu*, l. 27 and *m'msh*, l. 30) may be construed as pt., finite or inf. abs. forms, the son || scion being the subject. The two clear pts. in the series suggest that this is how the others can be read, and this is how I have construed the other vbs in the same bicola. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 423) treat the units as relative clauses: 'who will...' (thus also del Olmo 1981a: 369); Gibson (1978: 105) takes them all as (pt.) nouns: 'one to...' I have used 'shall' to indicate the modal sense: these are duties to be performed. Since there is no specifically royal element in the list of duties, we should think of a traditional form here taken up by the poet. 'One who stations himself': Boda (1993: 12-13), taking *nṣb* as relating to Heb. niph. form.

25. Ug. *skn*. 'Stela': del Olmo (1981a: 368, 595), citing √*skk*, Heb. *nesek* (by metath.)—sc. '(place of) libation', Akk. *šiknu*. So also Jirku (1962: 116), Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 421), Xella (1982: 194) and van der Toorn (1996: 154). Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 175): 'stelae'. Aistleitner (1964: 68): 'statue'. Gibson (1978: 104): 'steward'. *UT*, 449 §19.1754, 'stela', 'steward' (Heb. *sōkēn*); *WUS*, 220 §1909 ('administrator', Akk. *šaknu*, Heb. *sāgān*, *segen*). Margalit (1989a: 144, 268): 'tomb', 'literally "storage-place"'. He considers the term to represent a dolmen, and refers to the numerous dolmens of the Golan (sc. in the western Hauran, original setting of the story). The use of a raised stone monument ('stela'), surviving down to the present in the form of modern gravestones, is well established in antiquity as a memorial and votive offering on behalf of the dead, often inscribed with pious biographies or statements of cultic intent. A local (Ugaritic) example of the former is, e.g., the Mami stela, RS 1.[089] + 2.[033] + 5.183, found in the 'Baal temple' (Yon 1991: 322, 328 §8a and b). Examples of the latter are, e.g., KTU 6.13, 6.14 = RS 6.021, 028, (Yon 1991: 322, 334 §14a and b), the 'Dagan' stelae found on the south side of the south-easterly of the two acropolis temples, on the basis of which rests its identification as the Dagan-temple. Many of the other illus-

in the sanctuary[27] the cippus[28] of his kinsman[29];
into[30] the earth sending forth his dying breath[31], [II]

trated but uninscribed stelae from Ugarit may also have had funerary connections. 'To care for': Healey (1979: 355), followed by Boda (1993: 12-13).

26. Sc. 'the god of the ancestor' of KTU 1.47.2 = KTU 1.118.1 = RS 20.24.1. See n. 2 *ad loc.* This deity was presumably pluralized (*ilibh* implies a specific ancestral god) to account for all family needs. Margalit (1989a: 144): 'his (father's) ghost'. But there is no intrinsic reason to identify *ilib* || *'m* with the 'soul' of the father dying in the following bicolon. This bicolon deals with a cultic tradition of ancestor-invocation, the following one with a funeral. Whether *ilib* represents a deified ancestor, or perhaps rather a clan deity whose worship dates back to one's ancestors, remains uncertain. For the latter view see Pardee (1997c: 344, n. 6). See also at n. 29.

27. Ug. *bqdš*. That is, as a symbol of his presence before the resident deity? Margalit (1989a: 271) suggests that here and at KTU 1.169.8 it denotes the cemetery. The case for the latter is stronger than for here, where we should take into account the fact that stelae were found specifically in association with the temples at Ugarit. Tombs were beneath the floors of individual houses at Ugarit, though the dolmen-groups of the Golan may have constituted collective burial-grounds.

28. Ug. *ṯr*. Caquot and Del Olmo (1981: 368): 'votive cippus'. Tsevat (1971: 352): 'sun-emblem' (Hitt. *šittari*), followed by Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 175), Xella (1982: 194) and Pardee (1997c: 344 and n. 7). Sznycer (1974: 421): 'monument'; van der Toorn (1996: 154): 'symbol'; Jirku (1962: 116): 'protecting'; Aistleitner (1964: 68): 'streaming out' (cf. *WUS*, 98 §890); Pope (1981: 160 n. 4) and Boda (1993: 14): 'thyme'. De Moor (1985b: 408; 1987: 228 and n. 26): 'marjoram'. The two terms *skn* and *ṯr* being best construed as in parallel, a sense is required which is plausible for both.

29. Ug. *'mh*. The term *'m*, like *ilib*, is a recognized DN. It does not specifically mean the father. Rather 'maternal uncle'. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 421), with the alternative sense, 'clan', are thinking in terms of family solidarity. Cf. Margalit (1989a: 271). The presence of the possessive *-h* on both *ilib* and *'m* suggest that we do not have the formal use of DNs here, but rather the generic forms that in each case lie behind the DNs, denoting a type of spiritual entity, individualized in such and such a DN of the same name.

30. Ug. *l*. This is usually understood as 'from'. For the sense 'into', thus reversing the point of the son's ritual duties towards his father, making them part of the funeral service rather than a subsequent cult, see Xella (1982: 194) and Husser (1995: 118-26 [124]). Cf. KTU 1.6 ii 37, where it is perhaps the implicit failure to bury the fragments of Mot *and to keep them underground* which leads to his subsequent revival. Thus it is in no sense a reference to a cult of the dead, but rather to effective funeral rites, which are designed to deal with the dead by sealing them firmly in the underworld, thus freeing the world above from their continued (and now baneful and unwelcome) presence. Cf. also the passive vbs in KTU 1.161.2-

into the dust protecting[32] his progress[33];
he shall shut[34] the mouths[35] of his slanderers, [III]

12, which I suggest below (n. 8 *ad loc.*) are an indication of the fear in which the dead are held.

31. Ug. *qṭrh*. Lit. 'his smoke' (Heb. *qîṭôr*, Akk. *quṭru*). A metaphor for a man's last breath. Cf. KTU 1.18 iv (24-)26 and 1.169.2-3 for its similar occurrence with √*yṣa* (discussion in Husser 1995: 121-23). Note that this goes *into* the underworld. Interestingly this indicates on the surface a different anthropology from the familiar biblical one. There a divine breath is mixed with soil to make a human being (Gen. 2.7). At his death, Yahweh withdraws the divine breath (Job 34.14) and the body rejoins the soil from which it came (Gen. 3.19; Job 1.21; 10.9; 34.15; Ben Sira 40.1). But there remains something of a person's consciousness in Sheol (e.g. Pss. 6.6; 139.8), suggesting that more than mere flesh descends. Cf. also Samuel's '*ʿelōhîm*' (1 Sam. 28.13). The Ug. text confirms an archaic belief in a 'soul' of sorts which will now dwell in the tomb. The relation of this to the *rpum* (presumably the 'souls' of dead kings) remains unclear. A further passage to be considered with this one is KTU 1.18 iv 23-26. See n. 156 *ad loc.*

32. Ug. *ḏmr*. For the argument for taking this as a vb rather than as a n. (*mšsu* || *ḏmr* rather than *qṭrh* || *ḏmr aṯrh*) see Husser (1995: 118). It is vital that the rituals of burial be performed correctly, so that the deceased really enters the underworld. Hence the protective, apotropaic element. Perhaps something akin to the ancient Near Eastern and Gk fear of the dead lying unburied lies behind the allusion. Though Xella (1982: 194) takes the same broad line on this bicolon as Husser, he translates the present colon as 'and to the dust intones the song (*ḏmr*), over his tomb (*aṯrh*)'.

33. Ug. *aṯrh*. Husser (1995: 126) envisages the souls of the clan-ancestors coming together at the funeral to escort the newly-dead into the underworld. This is what appears to be happening in KTU 1.161, where the dead kings named are summoned not out of the underworld, but into the tomb which constitutes its threshold, where they will gather to welcome Niqmad into their company. At the funeral they await his descent among them, commanded by the officiant in ll. 20-26. A similar conception appears to lie behind the wording of Isa.14.9-20. But the dead kings there come not to welcome, but to taunt. Husser's approach supersedes the analysis of this colon by Caquot (1987: 8-10). Pardee (1997c: 344 and n. 8), translating 'his place', identifies this as the burial chamber under the floor of the house. Most houses at Ugarit, together with some at Mahadu (Minet el Beida), as well as a number of rooms in the palaces both at Ugarit and at Ras Ibn Hani, have complex corbelled burial chambers, evidently dating from the time of the construction of each building. Similar tombs have been found in the Peloponnese (hence the common designation 'Mycenaean'), but they have also been found at Mari and elsewhere.

34. Ug. *ṭbq*. *Hapax* in Ug. Ar. *aṭbaqa* used (intrans.) of 'closing' of mouth: Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 176). Cf. Heb. *dābaq*? *WUS*, 120 §1113.

he shall drive away those who are ill-disposed[36]
towards him.

1.17 i 30 Taking his hand when he is drunk, [IV]
supporting him [when] sated with wine[37];

35. Ug. *lḥt*. Either 'jaws' or 'mouth' (Heb. *lᵉḥî*, cf. Akk. *laḫû*?); thus Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 422), Gibson (1978: 104), del Olmo (1981a: 369), Xella (1982: 194) and van der Toorn (1996: 154); cf. *WUS*, 168-69 §1451, *DLU* √ I. Or on another approach 'accusations' (lit. 'tablets', presumably outlining a legal charge against someone, like a modern writ: cf. Heb. *luḥôt*). Cf. *WUS*, 168 §1449, *DLU* √ II. The latter term appears at KTU 1.2 i 26. Virolleaud (1936d: 189): 'tablets'. Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 176): 'abuse', Margalit (1989a: 144): 'calumnies', based on Ar. *laḥā*, 'to insult', Aram. *lḥy(t)*, 'evil'. On this approach the sense may be 'he will rebut the calumnies of those who malign him'.

36. Ug. *'šy*. Or 'those who attack'. *WUS*, 243 §2109, 'disturb, bother'; *DLU*, 93, 'do ill to someone, molest'. See useful discussion of the options in Caquot (1987: 10-11) and Margalit (1989a: 274-76). The latter's suggestion of Ar. *'s(s)*, 'grumble...' is suggestive, following his proposal to interpret *'šy* in KTU 1.17 vi 8 as 'spleen' (dismissed by Boda 1993: 19, who proposes 'attack', cf. Heb. √*'āsâ* pi.). Margalit further suggests a class distinction between his peers in the first colon, who give him verbal abuse (or threaten him with a lawsuit?), and his inferiors in the second, who threaten physical violence. But this may be reading too much into the text. His further remark (p. 276 n. 38), part of his general rejection of a kingly Danel, to the effect that were he really a king he would have paid retainers to perform these jobs, is not convincing in the face of the circumstantial evidence for his kingship. First, the list appears to be drawn from popular wisdom on filial duties, only secondarily applied here to a king; and secondly, there is a simplified presentation of Danel's kingdom, in which only immediate issues are mentioned, and only the actors appear, to work through one particular theme of family tragedy. It is the demands of folktale construction (Olrik 1909, discussed in relation to the Abraham narratives by van Seters 1975) rather than political reality which determine the format. (For a critique of Olrik see Whybray 1987: 142-52.)

37. As Husser notes, this is at first glance anomalous in a catalogue so far of primarily religious duties. It quite possibly refers to the father's participation in the rites of the Marziḥu, as proposed by Eissfeldt (1966). See also Margalit (1989a: 276-77), who notes the verbal similarities with KTU 1.114.16-19. Cf. the assistance given to El when he is inebriated in KTU 1.114.18-19 (noted also by de Moor 1987: 228 n. 31). There are six bicola here listing the son's duties. They are listed thus, as demonstrated by Husser (1995: 117), enumerating them from I to VI: duties III, IV and VI are to be performed during the father's old age; duties I, II and V after his death. This gives an a:a:b::b:a:b arrangement of the duties. We must remember that life expectancy was probably below forty in LB Ugarit, so that a father of that age was 'old'. Duties III and VI are domestic, duties I-II and IV-V are cultic. The pt. verbal forms (see n. 24 above) are used with duties II and IV, verbal

he shall serve up his share[38] in the house of Baal, [V]
and his portion in the house of El;

he shall plaster his roof on a [mu]ddy day, [VI]
he shall wash his clothes[39] on a filthy day[40].'[41]

ellipsis with duties I and V, so that in syntactic terms the final arrangement is a (ellipsis):a (2 pts):b (2 vbs)::b (2 pts):a (ellipsis):b (2 vbs).

38. Ug. *ksmh*. There are two options for the sense. Firstly, cf. Heb. *kusemet*, 'spelt' or 'emmer' (an early wheat); thus, e.g., *WUS*, 154 §1359 and Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 177), who note the term as a cereal offering in KTU 1.39.9 and 1.41.19. See also Pardee (1997c: 344): 'grain-offering'. Cf. however discussion at latter text (n. 30), where I have translated 'cups'. Secondly, 'share, portion' (thus, e.g., Dietrich and Loretz 1978b: 70; del Olmo 1981a: 369, 567; Margalit 1989a: 144). Cf. Heb. *kāsam*, Akk. *kasāmu*, 'cut in pieces', *kismu*. This affords a better parallel to *mnth*, 'his portion', in the following colon. De Moor (1987: 228 and n. 32) allows either sense. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 422 n. v) compare Num. 9.13, which refers to obligatory participation in sacrifices, envisaging the son standing in for his father on such an occasion.

39. Ug. *npṣh*. There is no need to see this as a military garment, as is implied in Margalit's (1989a: 279) discussion (cf. *npṣ ġzr* at KTU 1.19 iv 44), but quite likely that it refers to 'official' garments of some kind. *WUS*, 211 §1824, 'outer garment'. Gibson (1978: 153) cites Ar. *nifâḍu*, 'smock'. De Moor (1987: 229): 'his equipment'; Pardee (1997c: 344 and n. 11): 'his outfit'.

40. The apparently menial nature of these duties is evidence for Margalit (1989a: 279) against Danel's kingly status. But again, the list is traditional, and even though a prince would never soil his hands with such duties, he might like to be presented as so doing for piety's sake. The final expression *bym rṯ* may refer to 'the day of (its) filthiness', the epithet referring back to the clothing. Cf. Watson (1976c: 376).

41. This passage, ll. 26-33, occurring four times in quick succession in cols. i and ii, is a classic locus for analysis of the moral life of Ugarit. See Eissfeldt (1966), Koch (1967) and Healey (1979). All the values of family solidarity are enshrined here, and the essential role of the (eldest) son who performs all the key rituals which in effecting the present and future welfare of his father symbolizes that of the whole clan. Thus the folk-tale remains the vehicle for important social messages. The repetition, like a musical refrain (and we should be open to the possibility that this poetic material was declaimed to the accompaniment of musical instruments), reinforces the point. The high moral tone of such passages, to say nothing of the overall plots of the stories, belies the occasional theologically motivated presentation of Canaanite values as deficient or depraved. See Wyatt (1996b: 326-30, 393) and above at introduction to Aqhat, n. 1. Healey (1979: 356), whose analysis differs from the line taken above, describes this as 'a rare sample of Ugaritic wisdom literature'.

El took [a cup] <in (his) hand[42]:
a goblet in (his) right hand;
he did indeed bless[43]> his servant[44],

42. The text reads [--]*yiḫd.il.'bdh*, which would mean '[ ] El grasped his servant'! Cf. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 422), 'El took his servant [by the hand]', restoring [*byd*] in the lacuna. Scholars have subsequently tended to accept the proposal of Jackson and Dressler (1975), and independently Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 177-78) and Loewenstamm (1975a: 109). See also Pardee (1977, 1997c: 344), Parker (1979: 19-22) and Margalit (1989a: 144-45). Jackson and Dressler draw on the form of the blessing narrative in KTU 1.15 ii 16-20 to restore a better reading here. They explain it on the basis of a misreading of a word-divider as an 'ayin (so that for "*bdh*' we should read '*.bdh*', the the final *-h* would not have been present if *verbatim* as in the Keret version). We have a haplography on the part of Ilimilku or his scribe, involving a slip on a master document from '*.bd*' (or '*byd*') on one line to "*bdh*' on the next. Thus the whole of the second colon and parts of the first and the third of the Aqhat passage have been lost. This is confirmed by the suffix *h*, which belongs to *'bd*, 'servant', but perhaps not to *b(y)d*. Here are the two texts for comparison, with the proposed restoration in the Aqhat passage:

KTU 1.15 ii 16-20	KTU 1.17 i 34-<->-36
ks.yiḫd [il.b]yd	*[ks] yiḫd.il< byd(h)*
krpn.bn [ym]n	*krpn.bn ynn(h)*
brkm.ybrk ['bdh].	*brkm.ybrk > 'bdh*
ybrk.il.krt [r]	*ybrk [il.dnil].nt.rpi*
[ym]rm.nʿm[n.]ǵlm.il	*ymr.ǵzr [nt h]rnmy*

Note that *[ym]rm* in the Keret version carries enclitic *m*. The reading now established also draws attention to the term *'bd* in the tradition, which is important in determining Danel's royal nature (*pace* the declarations of Jackson and Dressler and Parker that it does not occur of Danel). Margalit does not appear to have noticed this point, though accepting the restoration. The same ritual procedure now occurs in both texts (in the same context, of El blessing a king who desires a son): El takes the cup of blessing; the bicolon, and the stereotyped formula of blessing which follows as a tricolon probably represents in the narrative an allusion to a fixed liturgical form. Only then do we have a form of words specific to the context, so that the one applied to Keret is different from that employed here. To El's ritual gesture cf. also KTU 1.1 iv 9-10, where he takes the cup during the rites of Yam's enthronement.

43. Cf. discussion of the usage at KTU 1.15 ii 18 above (n. 142 *ad loc.*).

44. See n. 42. 'His servant' prefaces the usual stereotyped formula of the poem, extending the bicolon into a tricolon. I cannot accept the force of Parker's (1979: 21-22) argument, which appears to want to deny the presence of *'bdh* in the text against all the evidence. The fact that it is used *hapax* of Danel is no proof that it cannot be so used! The Heb. term *'bd* has the specific overtone of 'gardener' (cf.

1.17 i 35 [El] blessed [Dane]l, the man of healing,
he gave a blessing to the hero, [the devotee of *H*]*rnm*:

'By my life! Danel, [the man of heal]ing, shall live!
by my vitality[45] the hero, the devotee of *Hrnm*!
[May] it [go] well with him![46]

Let him go up to his bed [and lie dow]n[47]:

1.17 i 40 from kissing his wife [let there come conception],
from his embracing her, pregnancy[48]!

[ ] let her give birth

Wyatt 1988b and 1990c), and alludes to cultic duties of the king. I think it highly likely that such nuances were also present in the Ug. term.

45. Ug. *npš.yḥ...brlt*. For this interpretation see also Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 178), followed by de Moor (1987: 229) and Margalit (1989a: 145), taking the *npš...brlt* to be oaths: 'By my life!... by my vitality!', with *ḥy* construed as a dd jussive. Cf. RS 8.333.20-22 [Nougayrol 1955: 8). Alternatively, cf. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 422), Gibson (1978: 104) and del Olmo (1981a: 370), etc. Their analysis would yield '(His) appetite let Danel [the ruler of Raph]a regain...'. See also Pardee (1997c: 344 and n. 13).

46. Text in Virolleaud (1936d: 187): *.hw.mḫ*, with a final angle-wedge of a preceding letter; cf. *CTA* (p. 80 n. 6); *KTU*[1 and 2]: [----]ḫ/ṭ.*hw.mḫ*. Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 178) compare KTU 1.19 iv 39, reading it *a*[-]*ḫ.ḥy.mḫ*, after *CTA*. There Virolleaud (1936d: 176) reads *a*[ ] *y* [.]*mḫ*, with the remains of a *ḫ* visible at the end of the first lacuna in pl. IV l. 201. According to *KTU*[1 and 2] the reading is *n*pš.*ḥy.mḫ*. The condition of the tablet precludes a certain decision either way, and the original reading is the safer of the two, providing (tentatively) a f. parallel to the m. formula used here. On the interpretation cf. de Moor (1987: 229 and n. 39): inf. abs. of *arḫ*, 'travel', with pron. and *mḫ*, 'marrow', lit. 'may (s)he travel marrow-like'. Perhaps the English expression 'more strength to his elbow!' captures the right nuance. Margalit (1989a: 119, 170) restores the text as [*wyrš*]*ḫ.hw.mḫ* (and [p. 140] at KTU 1.19 iv 39: n̊p̊š̊.*ḥy.mḫ*), and translates 'He, no other, [will lea]p from his (own) bed'.

47. Reading *l'ršḥ.y'l* $_{39}$ [*wyškb*]; cf. *KTU* [2], which reads [wyš]k]b. Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 178) draw attention to ll. 4 and 14 above ([*y'l*]*w yškb*). Margalit (1989a: 119, 145) construes quite differently, reading *y'l* $_{39}$ [l'rš.d]*d*. He translates (following his preceding colon [previous n.]): 'He'll mount the [bed of lov]e'. This is ingenious, but overbold.

48. On the formula cf. KTU 1.23.51, 56: [*hr*] || *ḥmḥmt*. De Moor (1987: 229 n. 41) understands *ḥmḥmt* to denote 'orgasm'. Margalit (1989a: 145, 172): '[(his) breath] will become heated... passionately'. He reconstructs the link between the cola as [whr hwt(h)] on grounds of space.

(from) the impregnation of <Danel[?]>, the man of healing.[49]

So that he may beget a son [in his house],
[a scion] in the midst of his palace.
[He shall set up the stela of his anc]estral god,
1.17 i 45 in the sanctuary [the cippus of his kinsman],
[into the ea]rth sending forth [his dying breath],
[into the dust pro]tecting his progress;

(about 10 lines missing, containing the following)

[He shall shut the mouth of his slanderers,]
[he shall drive away those who are ill-disposed towards him].
[Taking his hand when he is drunk,]
[supporting him when sated with wine,]
[He shall serve up his share in the house of Baal,]
[and his portion in the house of El;]
[he shall plaster his roof on a muddy day,]
[he shall wash his clothes on a filthy day.]
...'

1.17 ii (about 10 lines missing, probably narrating the conception and birth of Aqhat, and containing the following)

'...
[you have begotten[50] a son in your house,]
[a scion in the midst of your palace.]
[He shall set up the stela of your ancestral god,]

49. The interpretation of the last colon is conjectural, since there is no parallel to draw on.

50. In view of the discussion at KTU 1.17 ii 14, n. 57, concerning the birth of Aqhat, we should suppose, on the argument of Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 405, 425 n. f) and Husser (1996) that at some point in the lacuna between the two columns there would have been a brief narrative of Danel's love-making with his wife Dantiy, and (more or less immediately) the announcement of Aqhat's birth. (This argument is rejected by Parker 1989: 103.) Since I find Husser's analysis cogent, I have modified the form of the introduction to the third and fourth lists of filial duties in order to reflect the fact that Aqhat is now born.

[in the sanctuary] the ci[ppus of your kinsman];
[into the earth sending forth your dying breath],
into the dust the prot[ecting your progress].
[He shall shut] the mouths of your slanderers,
he shall driv[e away those who are ill-disposed towards you].
He shall serve up your share in the house of [Baal],
[and your portion] in the house of El,
taking your hand [when you are drunk],
supporting you when sated with wine,[51]
he shall plaster your roof on a muddy day,
he shall wash your clothes on a filthy day.'
Danel's[52] face showed his joy,
and above, his brow shone[53].[54]
He unfurrowed his brow and laughed;
his feet on the footstool he placed[55].
He lifted up his voice and cried:
'(At last) I may sit down and rest,
and (my) soul[56] can rest in my breast!

51. Two bicola have changed places, to be seen as a scribal error rather than poetic variant.

52. Text *unil*. Read *d*[1]*nil*.

53. Cf. the appearance of Moses in Exod. 34.29-30.

54. Margalit (1989a: 120, 174) proposes an extensive reconstruction of this bicolon.

55. The gesture is the same as that of El (KTU 1.4 iv 28-29). As Gray notes (1964: 60) this is a kingly gesture, used of Keret in Ginsberg's reconstruction (1946: 24) of KTU 1.15 iv 3. See n. 164 *ad loc*. If it is generally restricted to royalty (and gods, and even portraying kings as gods), as footstools in iconography and texts suggest, it tells against Margalit's objections (1989a: 6, 20, 40, 42, 253 etc.) to understanding Danel to be a king. We have the exception of the stools set out for heroes (warriors) by Anat in KTU 1.3 ii 22, 37; but these may represent enemy kings, or heroes dying in battle and becoming divinized. In KTU 1.4 i 34 a footstool is made by Kothar for Athirat; in KTU 1.4 iv 29 El uses one, while in 1.5 vi 13 he comes down to it from his throne and thence down to the ground, as a gesture of mourning. In KTU 1.6 i 60 Athtar's feet do not reach Baal's footstool.

56. Ug. *npš*, covering a range of meanings from 'thorax', through 'chest', 'lung', to 'appetite'. See *WUS*, 211-12 §1826, Heb. *nepeš*, Akk. *napāšu*, *napištu*.

For a son has been born to me[57] like my brothers,
and a scion like my kinsmen.

He shall raise up the stela of my ancestral god,
in the sanctuary the cippus of my kinsman,

<into the earth sending forth my dying breath,>
into the dust protecting [my] progress.[58]

He shall shut the mouths of my slanderers,
he shall drive away those who are ill-disposed towards me;

taking my hand when I am drunk,
supporting me when sated with wine.

He shall serve up my share in the house of Baal,
and my port[io]n in the house of El,

he shall plaster my roof on a muddy day,
he shall wash my clothes on a filthy day.'

Danel came <to>[59] his house;
Danel arrived at his palace.

The skilful goddesses[60] had entered[61] his house,
the daughters of Ellil, the Bright Ones[62].

57. Ug. *kyld.bn.ly*. This can be translated in one of two ways. 'For a son will be born to me', as future (thus, e.g., Gaster 1961: 338; Jirku 1962: 118; Aistleitner 1964: 69; Gibson 1978: 105; del Olmo 1981a: 372; de Moor 1987: 231; Margalit 1989a: 146; Aitken 1990: 35; Pardee 1997c: 345); or 'for a son is (or has been) born to me' as past (thus, e.g., Virolleaud 1936d: 198; Driver 1956: 51; Ginsberg 1969: 150; Caquot and Sznycer 1974: 425; Husser 1996: 90). As Husser points out, this is a well-known birth formula. He cites KTU 1.10 iii 36-37, Jer. 20.15, Isa. 9.5, and similar wording in KTU 1.23.52-53; Job 3.3; Lk. 2.10-11. Cf. Parker (1988). Husser notes (p. 91) that the 'love-scene' narrative would have occurred in the lacuna between cols. i and ii, and so would the event of the birth.

58. Margalit (1989a: 120, 146, 174-75) proposes a different reconstruction of the text at this point.

59. Margalit (1989a: 175) notes that a *l* is missing, perhaps through haplography.

60. Ug. *ktrt*, the f. pl. form of *ktr*, which as a DN is 'Kothar', the artificer god. There is no evidence of a link between the god and the goddesses. See Pardee (1995: col. 917). Further discussion in Margalit (1989a: 285-86).

61. Ug. *'rb*. On the pluperfect force of the qatala form see Husser (1996: 91-92).

62. These DNs are discussed at KTU 1.24.5-6 nn. 6-8.

Then Danel the man of healing,
at once[63] the hero, the devotee of *Hrnm*
1.17 ii 30 slaughtered[64] an ox for the skilful goddesses:
he fed the skilful goddesses
and gave the daughters of Ellil, the Bright Ones, to drink[65].

Lo,
a day and a second
he fed the skilful goddesses
and gave the daughters of Ellil, the Bright Ones, to drink.

A third, a fourth day
1.17 ii 35 he fed the skilful goddesses
and gave the daughters of Ellil, the Bright Ones, to drink.

A fifth, a sixth day
he fed the skilful goddesses
and gave the daughters of Ellil, the Bright Ones, to drink.

Behold,
1.17 ii 40 on the seventh day[66] the skilful goddesses departed from his house,
the daughters of Ellil, the Bright Ones,

those who apportion the delights of the bed of conception,
the joys of the bed[67] of childbirth.

63. Ug. *apnk*...*ap*[.]*hn*. The same formula as at KTU 1.17 i 1, beginning a new sequence of activities.

64. Ug. *ṭbḫ*, though we might have expected *dbḥ*, 'sacrificed... to'.

65. The vbs √*lḥm*, √*šqy*, used in this bicolon are already trans. in the D and G stem respectively ('feed... give to drink') in KTU 1.17 i 7-8 and repetitions of the formula. Here the Š stem is used for both vbs, perhaps with intended climactic effect, to suit the fulfilment of Danel's wishes.

66. The seven-day pattern is probably as much a literary construction as a ritual one. Cf. n. 270 at KTU 1.16 v 20-21 and n. 14 at 1.17 i 15. The present instance is strictly antiphonal to the latter. Husser's (1996: 86) analysis shows convincingly that the two cultic scenes frame the first act in the drama, resolving the problem of Danel's childlessness. He sees the goddesses (p. 92) as presiding over the critical first six days of the new-born child's life. Cf. their functions as outlined in KTU 1.24.48-50, covering everything from the nuptials to the birth of a child. Not just mid-wives but health-visitors!

67. 'Delights... joys of the bed...'. For an alternative sense as a superlative

Danel sat down [and coun]ted his[68] months.
A month, a second month passed,
1.17 ii 45 a third, a fourth [month passed][69].
The months came to [years?]

(about 10 lines missing)

1.17 iii (entire column missing, about 50-60 lines)

1.17 iv (entire column missing, about 50-60 lines)

1.17 v (gap)

'...
1.17 v 1 [ ]
[ ] I shall bring a bow, "Precious"[70];

construction see Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 426): 'the most delightful...most beautiful of beds...'. So also Caquot (1987: 11-12). Cf. n. 51 at KTU 1.5 vi 6-7.

68. Sc. Aqhat's.

69. In view of the fact that Aqhat has already been born, these months must be those of his infancy. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 426 n. m) compare the 'months to years' formula of KTU 1.6 v 7-8. The restoration ['š]*r*, to give 'ten months' (sc. of pregnancy, as at KTU 1.23.<51>, 57) is conjectural. Note that the formula of the present narrative does not conform to the pattern of KTU 1.23. This view is rejected by Pardee (1997c: 345 n. 23).

70. Text *ṯmn*(?): Virolleaud (1936d: 201); ṯmn[?]: *CTA*; ṯ*m*n*: *KTU*[1]; ×mn[-]: *KTU*[2]. I interpret this not simply as an epithet of the bow, but its name. Cf. ll. 35-36 below. The name appears at KTU 1.19 i 5 as *ṯmn*, subj. of *yṯbr*. It is m. in form, though *qšt* is f. Perhaps a manly name for a manly weapon. See Margalit's (1989a: 75) assessment: 'its symbolism... denoting maturity and manhood'. Note his translation 'of great value' (1989: 148, 290). (See also Margalit 1979: 556, for the link with Ar. *ṯamīn*, 'precious', endorsed by Cooper 1988: 20.) Cf. the names of Baal's maces in KTU 1.2 iv 11-12, 19. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 427 and n. o) understand as adv. 'there'. So also Parker (1979–80: 30; 1989: 108), del Olmo (1981a: 374) and Pardee (1997c: 345). Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 180) and de Moor and Spronk (1987: 105) read a doubtful md[rkt], with de Moor (1987: 233 and n. 60) translating hesitantly as 'bent, loaded'; cf. Isa. 5.28, 21.15, the n. suggesting, on reading *ṯmn*, 'as a present'. Virolleaud (1936d: 203): 'eight'; Gibson (1978: 107 and n. 1): 'eight (parts)', referring to its constituent parts, being a composite bow. Even on taking it as a name as above, this is the etymological basis, 'eight' being a superlative beyond the perfect number seven. Or perhaps this bow will sing like

I shall produce many arrows'.

And lo, on the seventh day,

1.17 v 5 then[71] Danel the man of healing,
at once the hero, the devotee of *Hrnm*,
arose and sat by the entrance to the gate,
beneath the trees which were by the threshing-floor.[72]

He tried the case of the widow,
he judged the cause of the orphan[73].

In lifting up his eyes he looked

a lyre (*ṯmnt*)? The name may have been chosen to echo these various nuances.

The weapon is a composite bow, as is clear later from the description of its parts at KTU 1.17 vi 20-24. For discussion of this breakthrough in military technology see Margalit (1989a: 290-91), and also Albright and Mendenhall (1942), Yadin (1947; 1963: 6-8, 47-48). For surviving examples from Egypt see McLeod (1970, 1982).

71. Ug. *apnk*. This term (with parallel *a<p>hn*) normally introduces a new narrative section, but reads awkwardly after the previous colon. Has something been omitted?

72. The city-gate and the threshing floor were important for the legal and ritual procedures respectively of a community. 'Beneath the trees' (*ṯḥt adrm*). Margalit (1989a: 148): 'alongside the notables'. Similarly del Olmo (1992a: 133 and n. 88) in discussing *ṯḥt* in KTU 1.161.22-26, and Pardee (1997c: 346). If the 'trees' option be accepted, it is worth asking (though we have insufficient evidence to answer) the question as to whether we have an element of royal arboreal symbolism here. The Israel-Judahite goddess Asherah, the mythological mother of the king, was evidently worshipped in the form of a tree-trunk, whether living or dead, while the Assyrian tree-of-life motif appearing widely on seals and reliefs was closely bound up not only with the rituals, but also the ideology of the king. What is so striking about the latter material is its close resemblance to late Heb. kabbalistic systems. See in particular Parpola (1993). It is tempting to think that there may be an ancient WS tradition, of which only hints now remain, but may yet be rediscovered. But perhaps this is reading too much into the present text.

73. Typical royal duties, as at KTU 1.16 vi 33-34, 45-48. Margalit (1989a: 253) argues that this is no real kingship, but appears to be clutching at straws. He is quite right on insisting that this folktale probably has nothing intrinsically to do with Ugaritic royal ideology (though Ilimilku's role should not be underestimated). But this does not alter the fact that Danel is portrayed as a king as already noted above. We have drawn attention to the use of *'bdh*, 'his servant', at 17 i 34 (n. 44) indicates Danel's royal status; and his use of a footstool (*hdm*) at 17 ii 11 (n. 55) is further evidence. See also at KTU 1.19 iii 46 (n. 250) and Wyatt 1999a, 249-51.

over a thousand miles,
ten thousand leagues,

the coming of Kothar he did espy
and saw the approach of Hasis.

Look!
He was bringing a bow[74]!
Look!
he had produced many arrows!

Then Danel, the man of healing,
at once the hero, the devotee of *Hrnm*,
aloud to his wife did cry:

'Listen, maiden[75] Dantiy!

Prepare[76] a lamb in flour[77]
to the taste of Kothar-and-Hasis,
according to the liking of Hayin,
who is the ambidextrous craftsman![78]

74. For Gaster (1961: 342) it is a matter of a number of weapons: 'carrying bows, | bearing arcs by the dozen'. This would seem to detract from the special nature of his gift, if he is going to pass them round like mere trinkets.

75. Ug. *mṯt*. At KTU 1.14 iii 39 and at other instances in the Keret story I have translated this as 'maiden', because of the bridal quality of Hurriy, and continued with the same translation after her children are born. See n. 167 at KTU 1.15 iv 3. Here Dantiy is also now a mother, but I have offered the same translation. If purism were to prevail, we should perhaps translate as 'maiden' before and 'mistress' or even 'matron' after the consummation of the marriage. The precise nuance of the term *mṯt* remains elusive.

76. Ug. *'db*. Or 'offer up', in the cultic sense. I have used the 'neutral' translation since the narrative probably hovers on the dividing line between cultic act and culinary preparation. So also at l. 22. Cf. also the use of the word at KTU 1.114.4, 10. The gods appear in this narrative in more or less human form, acting as characters on the same level as Danel, his wife, and Aqhat. In l. 27 *y'db*, || *ytnn* of l. 26, has the sense 'placed'.

77. Ug. *pḫd*. Cf. Akk. *paḫīdu*, a kind of flour (thus Caquot and Sznycer 1974: 428 and n. y; Parker 1979–80: 22-23), rather than *puḫādu*, 'lamb' (thus *WUS*, 255 §2212). For the latter sense see Gibson (1978: 107): 'youngling(s)'; Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 181 and n. 104: note Parker's response: 1979–80: 22-23); de Moor (1987: 234): 'stock'; Margalit (1989a: 148): 'flock'. Note also Xella's important study (1978) on the symbolism in operation here, and also Xella (1983b).

78. This domestic presentation of events should not be seen as incompatible with the royal aspect of the narrative. The scene may be compared with that of Gen.

Feed the god, give him to drink,
wait on (him) and honour him,
the Lord of Egypt, of all of which he is god[79].'

Maiden Dantiy obeyed.

She prepared a lamb in flour
to the taste of Kothar-and-Hasis,
according to the liking of Hayin,
who is the ambidextrous[80] craftsman.

Then Kothar-and-Hasis arrived.

Into Danel's hands he put the bow;
onto his lap he placed the arrows.

Then
maiden Dantiy fed the god[81] and gave him to drink,
she waited on (him) and honoured him,
the Lord[82] of Egypt, of all of which he is god.

Kothar departed to his tent;
Hayin departed to his dwelling[83].

Then Danel the ma[n] of healing,
at once the hero, the devotee of *Hrnm*,
the bow he bent[?] [84] [and b]lessed[85],

18.1-15 (Xella 1978). Abraham too is a royal ancestor.

79. Ug. *il klh*. See n. 21 at KTU 1.1 iii [0]. Pardee (1997c: 346) translates this tricolon in the pl., as the form *hmt* in l. 20 requires, and the form *ilm* in the same line could be construed. This would require Kothar to be accompanied by an entourage of other Memphite gods, which seems unlikely in so far as they are nowhere else mentioned.

80. Cf. KTU 1.1 iii 5 n. 23.

81. Text *ilm*, to be read as sg. with enclitic. Cf. also at l. 20, and n. 79: the reading *hmt* at l.20 requires correction to **hwt*. The confusion may result from the binomial DN.

82. A rare instance of the generic use of *b'l* in Ug.

83. Cf. KTU 1.15 iii 18-9 n. 158.

84. Text *yqb*. See Virolleaud (1936d: 202 and pl. VII), *CTA*, *KTU*^{2}. Margalit (1989a: 177) defends this reading, noting a word-divider in Virolleaud's transcription, against *KTU*^{1}. He takes this to be √*qbb*, 'bend a bow', as does Gaster (1961: 344). I have provisionally followed this interpretation. De Moor (1987: 235): 'named'. Gibson (1978: 108) and Pardee (1997c: 346 n. 31) leave untranslated. Driver (1956: 52), reading *yqbl*, 'presented'. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 429 and n. c), reading *yqbṣ*, 'grasps'.

on behalf of Aqhat indeed he ben[t it].

'The first-fruits of your hunting, O my son,
[ ] the first-fruits of your hunting,
lo, the f[irst-fruits of] the hunt
in his[86] temple [you should place]'.[87]

(gap of about 11 lines)

1.17 vi (gap of about 9 lines)

'...

1.17 vi 1 [ ]
[Eat from any of the f]ood,
[and drink from the vat] any [wine] un[til satiety[88]]!'[89]

W[hile they ate the gods drank],[90]

<then they were served suckling animals,>[91]
1.17 vi 5 with jaw-shaped knife a fillet of fatling.

[From goblets they drank] wine,
from cups of gold [the juice of grapes].[92]

[ ] goblet after goblet.

The new wine [ ],
the wine [ ] the spleen in her girdle.[93]

85. Tentatively restoring [*yb*]*rk*. Cf. *KTU*[2].

86. Sc. Kothar's, as a thank-offering for the gift. This cannot, so far as I know, be identified with any historical temple of Ptah-Kothar in Syria-Palestine. It is hardly likely to be an allusion to Memphis.

87. Cf. the ritual laws for domestic animals in Exod. 13.12-14, 22.28-30, and Abel's conformity to it in Gen. 4.4. The present allusion presupposes a similar convention in a hunting context. Cf. KTU 1.114.1 and n. 6.

88. Accepting the suggestion of *KTU*[2] to read '[*d*], and restoring '[*d šb*']; cf. KTU 1.114.3, 16.

89. Cf. KTU 1.23.6.

90. The language is formulaic. Cf. KTU 1.4 vi 55. Evidently Aqhat makes his offering to the gods, who come down to participate in the sacrifice, which from their perspective is a feast. Among their number is Anat, who sees the bow...

91. Cf. KTU 1.4 vi 56.

92. Cf. KTU 1.4 iv 36-38, vi 58-59, and accepting their wording rather than that of Driver (1956: 53) or *KTU*[2]. So also Margalit (1989a: 149) and others.

93. Most commentators leave ll. 7-8 untranslated. Margalit (1989a: 150, 179, 275) makes a reasonable case for understanding it to narrate Anat's progressive

[ ]
1.17 vi 10 [ ][94]

In lifting up her eyes she[95] saw [the bow].
[beautiful was the for]m of its string,
like lightning [its arrows].[96]
[ ] deeps,
lightning[97] [ ].
She coveted[98] the bow, the work of [Kothar-and-Hasis]

intoxication, as she swallows cup after cup of wine. The term *'šy* he interprets as 'spleen'. This would explain the goddess's later splenetic behaviour! It remains provisional. Cf. the approach of Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 430 and nn. i, j), though they take *'šy lḥbš* to mean 'wine pressed from the wine-press'. An entirely different line is taken by de Moor (1987: 236), following Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 184), who restore text and sense on the basis of KTU 1.5 iv 19-22 (omitted above as unintelligible). I am reluctant to explain *obscurum per obscurius.*

94. Fragmentary. Margalit (1989a: 150) reconstructs to give an account of Aqhat stringing the bow. Cf. de Moor (1987: 236).

95. Sc. Anat. The text initially naming her is lost.

96. Text [ ]×*l.kslh* | *kbrq* [ ] (*KTU*^{2}). Construed on the basis of Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 185). The surviving words are hardly to be construed together, as by del Olmo (1981a: 376): 'its string [shone(!)] like a ray...'. The simile of lightning (*brq*) suits rather the arrows which fly from the string (*ksl*). Cf. de Moor (1987: 237), who takes *kslh* to mean 'its stave'. Margalit's (1989a: 150) interpretation as a description of Anat's reaction is improbable in my view.

97. The surviving signs in l. 12 read: [ ]*mḫ*(?)*ǵ'p*(?).*thmt.brq* (Virolleaud 1936d: 206); [ ]m(h/y)ǵ(d/'t).*thmt.brq* (CTA); [ ]*k.yǵḏ.thmt.brq* (Dijkstra and de Moor 1975: 185; *KTU*^{2}); [ky]m̊(.)yǧ̊'(p̊/t̊).*thmt brq* [m kyprq.y'rm] (Margalit 1989a: 124). *KTU*^{1} was closer to Virolleaud. It is evident that the initial signs are intractable, and that any attempt at translation beyond individual words is hazardous, not to say suspect. Even their syntactical relationship is imponderable, though I agree provisionally with Margalit that they probably belong to different cola. His (1989a: 150, 181-82) attempt at a resolution is bold, but too bold for this commentator: '[like a se]a which roils the deeps, | (Like) lightning-bolts [which sunder a forest]'. It is a conjecture that builds on a hypothesis. It would constitute the continuation of the account of Anat's emotional reaction. Cf. also Driver (1956: 53) and de Moor (1987: 237 and n. 88). Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 430 and n. l) take the terms *thmt brq* together: 'the din of the thunder', explaining *thmt* by ref. to Heb. *hāmâ*, 'make a noise'.

98. Ug. *tṣb*. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 430 n. m) cite Akk. *ṣabû*, Aram. *ṣebâ*, 'desire', Ar. *ṣabā*, 'aspire to'; *WUS*, 263 §2298 also cites Akk. *ṣibū*. Cf. del Olmo (1981a: 613), but see the remarks of Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 185 n. 123). They

[of which the hor]ns were like a coiled serpent[99].

1.17 vi 15 [Her goblet she dropped] to the ground,
her cup she spilled [in the dust].[100]

[She lifted up her voice] and cried:
'Listen, pray, [O hero Aqhat]!

Ask for silver and I shall give (it) you,
[for gold and I shall be]stow (it) on you.

Just[101] give your bow to [Virgin] Ana[t],
your arrows to the Beloved of the Powerful One!'

1.17 vi 20 But[102] Aqhat the hero replied:

'The mightiest ash-trees from Lebanon,
the strongest sinews from wild bulls,
the hardest horns from mountain goats,
<the toughest> tendons from the hocks of a bull,[103]
the sharpest[104] reeds[105] from the great marsh[106],

prefer '(Anat) would aim the bow'. I fail to see the force of their argument, however, since good cognates exist. Cf. also perhaps Heb. √*ṣbh* II (BDB, 839).

99. Unstrung, the ends ('horns' because they probably consisted of a horn laminate) bend backwards, to form an almost complete ellipse whose curvature is the reverse of the bow's strung profile. On the final *yqr* cf. Caquot (1987: 13-14). The simile, like the bow itself, is full of pent-up energy.

100. Cf. Keret's daughter dropping her vase in her confusion at KTU 1.16 i 53-54. See also Qoh. 12.6.

101. Text *w*. The sense is adversative. Or: 'But ... '.

102. See previous note.

103. A composite bow's power was determined by the skilful harnessing of the different tensility and elasticity of its component materials. See discussion at n. 70 above. See also Watson (1976c: 372-73), who draws attention to Anat's possession of a bow in KTU 1.3 ii 16.

104. 'Mightiest ... sharpest'. The same Ug. term *adr* is used in each case (restored as penultimate word in l. 22). Cf. the various translations offered for *il* in KTU 1.4 i 30-41 (and n. 95 *ad loc.*). In each case there seems to be a deliberate evocation of all the possible contextual nuances of the same word, rather than a fall-back on a paucity of vocabulary. Pardee (1997c: 346 and n. 37) takes *adr* to be a vb (√*ndr*): 'I'll vow'. But this would mean Aqhat himself supplying the components, which seems unlikely to be what he intends. Watson (1995a: 220) notes Garbini's (1990) appeal to the vb *adr*, Phoen. *azr*, 'cut', and Renfroe's (1992: 35 and n. 21) appeal to *dry*, 'carry, fetch', as in Aram. Here again Aqhat is supposed to do the work.

105. For making the arrows.

give to Kothar-and-Hasis:

let *him* construct a bow for Anat,
1.17 vi 25 arrows for the Beloved of the Powerful One!'

And Virgin Anat replied:
'Ask for life, O hero Aqhat:
ask for life and I shall give (it) you,
immortality and I shall bestow (it) on you[107]:

I shall make you number (your) years with Baal:[108]
With the son of El you shall number months.

1.17 vi 30 "Like Baal he shall live indeed[109]!

Alive, he shall be feasted,
he shall be feasted and given to drink[110].

The minstrel shall intone and sing concerning him".[111]'

[And she[112]] said to him:

106. Perhaps the Hule marsh is to be understood, or the undrained Orontes valley. Cf. the setting of KTU 1.92 and n. 3 *ad loc.*

107. Ug. *aštḫk*. Construed as √*štḥ*, 'send, grant'. Cf. Albright's (1944: 32) suggestion, 'I will give thee life-force', construing the vb as √*lḥḥ*, 'be moist, fresh, vigorous', with the nuance of sexual vigour. The stichometry is against this interesting proposal.

108. 'Years ... months': it looks suspiciously as though the terms have been inadvertently reversed, since the movement is towards an anti-climax.

109. The first *k* is comparative, the second emphatic. Alternatively, if my construction be rejected, this might be translated 'For Baal lives indeed!'. Pardee (1997c: 347): 'like Ba'lu (who), when he comes (back) to life'.

110. Ug. *wšqynh*. Lit. 'and one gives him to drink'. The suff. proves that it is the immortal hero who is the beneficiary of the feasting and drinking. Note how paradise is expressed in gastronomical terms. On the translation cf. Margalit (1989a: 151). Contrast Gibson (1978: 109) whose translation is ambiguous, since it is unclear whether it is Baal or the hero who is the guest of honour. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 432), followed by Cazelles (1979–80: 181-82), have Baal waiting at the hero's table. Gaster (1961: 348) has Baal the one who is feted. So also Pardee (1997c: 347).

111. Cf. KTU 1.3 i 18-22, iii 4-6. Here it is the immortal hero who is the subject of song. The hero's name will live on in the lays of the poets. But of course Anat is conjuring up a picture of him being alive to hear them. I have put the four cola in inverted commas, as part of a putative hymn which Anat is citing. This would explain the abrupt change of person.

112. Virolleaud (1936d: 207, though notice his hesitation: [*wy*(?)]'*nn*) took this to be m. Herdner (*CTA*, 83): [*wt*]'*nn*; so also *KTU*[1]. *KTU*[2] reverts to Virolleaud's

'Thus shall I make Aqhat the hero live!'
But Aqhat the hero replied:
'Do not deceive me, O Virgin,
1.17 vi 35 for to a hero your deceit is rubbish![113]
Man, (at his) end[114], what will he receive?
What will he receive, a man (as his destiny)?
A precious substance[?] will be poured [on] his head,
gold[?][115] on top of his skull,

reading. But this makes nonsense of the context. It requires the gratuitous introduction of a third party. See the attempts of Driver (1956: 55), Jirku (1962: 123), Aistleitner (1964: 72), del Olmo (1981a: 378), Xella (1982: 201) and de Moor (1987: 239). Margalit (1989a: 125, 150) hedges his bets. Gibson (1978: 109) has in my view the correct interpretation.

113. This is not the most tactful response to a goddess. But Aqhat has all the directness and impetuosity of youth. It would be wrong to suppose that Anat foresaw this response. The tragedy plays out as goddess and hero talk past each other. They are similar in character in this respect. On *ḫḫ* see del Olmo (1981a: 551), de Moor (1987: 67 n. 309). Perhaps '*Fæx tauri*!'?

114. Ug. *uḫryt*. Margalit (1989a: 151), on a different syntax: 'a spiked-shaft (in) the posterior'! See his subsequent discussion of the expression *mm uḫryt* (1989: 313-15).

115. 'Precious substance...gold'. Ug. *spsg*...*ḥrṣ*. The precise sense here is uncertain. See Albright (1944: 33 n. 19) for the suggestion that it is an allusion to the smearing of hot asphalt on the heads of criminals in Mesopotamian legal tradition ('tarring and feathering'!) translated into a metallurgical idiom. He translates *spsg* as 'a bowl of dross'. He also (1945) notes Virolleaud's comparison between the term here and Prov. 26.23, on which see further below. We have no evidence of such a practice, and its transformation in substance and context begs the question. Nor (*pace* Caquot and Sznycer 1974: 432-33 and nn. b, c, E.M. Good 1977 and Margalit 1984a; 1989a: 307-10, 316-19: he criticises Caquot and Sznycer unfairly), is it, as has often been subsequently thought, an allusion to the ancient practice of making clay-modelled features on ancestral skulls as practised in aceramic Neolithic Jericho, notwithstanding Margalit's elegant attempt to show that KTU 1.19 i 8-9 is actually based on the Neolithic practice. Is it a description of old age, with silvered hair? Thus Driver 1956: 55 n. 8; Gibson 1978: 109 n. 10; Spronk 1986: 152 n. 3; de Moor 1987: 239 nn. 105, 106. See also Rainey 1965–66: 254; 1971: 154; Pardee 1997c: 347 and n. 46. Renfroe's cautions (1992: 118-21 [118-19]) are worth citing: '(Aqhat) says, arguably, that something called *spsg* will be poured on his head and *ḥrṣ* will be poured on his pate. We do not know what *spsg* is... the claim that it must refer to glaze in some general sense renders *ḥrṣ* in the sense 'potash' a questionable parallel'. Cf. Dijkstra and de Moor 1975: 190 and *DLU* 181.

[and] the death of all I shall die,
and I shall surely die.[116]

See now Neu (1995), who concludes that it is a precious mineral. It is this which has led me to propose the translation above. I suggest that *ḥrṣ* is perhaps a simple mistake for *ḫrṣ*, 'gold', so that two terms for a precious substance are in parallel: I propose that the text refers to the practice attested in Mycenaean culture of placing gold death-masks in the tomb. These may in turn be compared with Philistine anthropoid sarcophagi and Egyptian sarcophagi. In each case, a memorial of the deceased is preserved in a likeness. (Cf. Schliemann's famous remark: 'I have gazed on the face of Agamemnon!'.) The suggestion remains hypothetical, since no such death-mask has yet been found at Ugarit. But there is no reason why Ugaritic tradition should not have been familiar with the practice of neighbouring cultures, and since tomb-robbery had been developed to a fine art in antiquity it would be the presence of gold in excavations rather than its absence which was cause for remark. This proposal is at least no more improbable than that they should be familiar with mortuary practices of four thousand years previously.

The word *spsg* being *hapax*, there is nothing we can say about its unparalleled relation with *ḫ'rṣ*, except that its first letters invite the restoration *<k>sp(sg)*, since *ksp* is the usual pair-word accompanying *ḫrṣ*. This then brings us back to the Prov. 26.23 expression *kesep siggîm*, which Ginsberg (1945b: 21 n. 55) proposed reading as *k-spsg*[*ym*], 'like glaze' on the strength of the Ug. Perhaps the original *kesep* is to be retained here, and restored to the Ug. text as *<k>spsg* || **ḫ'rṣ*. The *-sg(ym)* remains unexplained in both cases, but that is another problem. This is a conjecture, however, and for the present I am following Neu's suggestion. (The term *ḥrṣ* as it appears here means 'chisel' at KTU 1.19 i 8, which could suggest trepanning, but would lose the parallel.) While on my approach the vb *ysk* (√*nsk*) requires explanation, it may be compared with *yšlḥ* parallel *yṣq* at KTU 1.4 i 25-28 (nn. 88-89 *ad loc.*). In support of my reinterpretation of *ḥrṣ* as *ḫ'rṣ*, cf. the different spellings of the name of Yasib's brother:

KTU Ref.	Virolleaud	*KTU*[2]	*CPU*, II.1: 220	My Reading
1.16 i 46	*ilḥu*	*ilḫu*	*ilḫu*	*ilḫu*
1.16 i 58	*ilḥu*	*ilḫu*	*ilḫu*	*ilḫu*
1.16 ii 21	[ ]	*ilḫu*	*ilḫu*	[ ]
1.16 ii 33	*ilḥu*	*ilḫu*	*ilḫu*	*ilḫu*?

It has to be admitted that the tablet surface is in a very poor shape. Cf. also *phr* for *pḫr* in KTU 1.2 i 20. Evidently the aural niceties of the philologists were not always maintained!

116. This interchange between Anat and Aqhat is a *locus classicus* for understanding Ug. beliefs concerning human destiny. Yet it is hazardous to attempt the construction of a systematic theology out of this material, if only on the ground that Aqhat abruptly rejects what is offered as a false hope. He is no soft touch for promises of jam tomorrow! However, it is an interesting, and very early, example of the pushing forward of the boundaries of human thought, which give verbal form

[And anoth]er thing let me say:
1.17 vi 40 bows (are for) warriors!
Will women hunt now?'[117]

[Outward]ly Anat laughed;
but in (her) heart she devised [a plot][118].

to an idea, and thus in effect create a concept, which can later be reified as 'fact' within a believing community. For a discussion of the topic see Spronk (1986: 142-206). If there was a general belief in some kind of survival, to which Aqhat might be expected to subscribe, then what Anat offers is something of a different order of magnitude, a species of divine life, since she uses Baal and his revival from death as her example. The same contrast between human realism and theological aspiration (treated in both cases as wishful thinking) is seen in Gilgamesh, with the contrast between what the hero wants and what Siduri advises. See van der Toorn (1996: 65). There it is Gilgamesh who is unrealistic. Within the Aqhat story the contrast is to be drawn between Anat's offer and the broad expectation presupposed by the list of the duties of the pious son (KTU 1.17 i 26-33 etc.), which we may take as normative. As we have seen (n. 30 above), the usual explanation of duty [III] as bringing the father's ghost *out of* the grave is precisely the opposite of what the text actually says, so that Spronk's estimate (1986: 149) is flawed. To build any theory of *post-mortem* felicity on the basis of this is a lost cause. The safest position to adopt is that Anat is using a flowery promise merely to get her way. Gods are not above lying, as the serpent and Micaiah both observed (Gen. 3.3-5; 1 Kgs 22.20-25).

117. Aqhat adds insult to injury, by talking down to Anat on the ground that she is female. She does not perceive herself in this way! But, though he betrays his ignorance of mythology, which abounds in toxological goddesses, of course he states a truism, for roles would have been divided broadly on gender lines in Ugaritic society. Anat's transcendence of this fundamental boundary is part of the complexity of her character and theology. Handy's somewhat condescending estimate of the goddess (1994: 123) as 'violent, vindictive, vengeful, self-absorbed, and insolent' is entirely true, and yet wholly fails to account for the subtlety of her nature. See my remarks (1996b: 329).

118. Margalit (1989a: 8) criticizes Virolleaud for his 'inability to conceive of the goddess Anat as a "Devil-figure" who commits murder for material gain'. I am unhappy with a polarization (into demon and deity) which is the product of later modes of thinking. All supernatural powers (sc. projections of the Ugaritic psyche) are divine (*il* or *ilt*) whether they work for good or ill. They represent the outworkings of the human mind, and show the 'logical' outcome of human decisions (indeed, the gods are in a sense tools of the mind in the working out of problems, 'decision-making' facilities). Cf. my remarks on Anat as war-goddess at KTU 1.3 ii 37 n. 34. And while demons are routinely distinguished from deities in ancient tradition, as in KTU 1.169 for instance (see n. 5 to l. 2), the fact remains that Anat is consistently represented as a goddess, even if not a very nice one to know. On

'Leave me, O hero Aqhat,
leave me and go away [ ][119].

If I ever meet you on the path of transgression,
[if I encounter you] on the path of pride,

1.17 vi 45 I myself shall throw you down beneath [my feet],
O gracious one, strongest of men!'[120]

[She stamped her f]eet and the earth shook[121].

Then [indeed]
[she set her f]ace towards El at the source[122] of the rivers,
[amidst the spri]ngs of the two deeps.

She rolled back the tent of El
[and came to the pa]vilion of the king, the Father of the Bright One.

1.17 vi 50 [At the feet of El she] bowed and fell down.
She paid him hom[age and honoured] him.[123]

She vilified Aqhat the hero,
[the child of Dan]el the man of healing.

And [Virgin Anat] spoke;
[she lifted up] her voice and cried:

'Words [of insolence?] did Aqhat [speak?]!

1.17 vi 55 [ ]

problems of terminology see Riley (1995).

119. Pardee (1997c: 347): 'Reconsider...reconsider for your own sake': this is a good alternative approach, though the translation above fits the sequel better.

120. As she hovers between threats and flattery, we can almost hear the internal debate in Anat's mind, for she appears to be motivated by lust and rage in equal proportion. I say 'lust' rather than desire, for while there may be a conscious sexual dimension in her later dialogue with the hero—though not at KTU 1.18 i 24 and n. 132, *qv*.—it is here at an inchoate stage, felt more in her loins than in her head. For an exquisite account of Anat's warring emotions see KTU 1.19 i 1-17. Pardee (1997c: 348) translates: '(however) good and strong (you may be) among men'. This draws attention to the tension in general gender terms.

121. Ug. *tr*. 'Took off', with Anat as subj.: Pardee (1997c: 348).

122. Text *mbr*. Correct to *mbk*.

123. Ll. 46-51 are formulaic, occurring several times in the Baal cycle (KTU 1.3 v 4-8 and parallels)

[Ilimilku the Shubanite wrote (it), the student of Attanu]
the diviner.

1.18 i (first 5 lines fragmentary)

1.18 i 6 And [Virgin Anat] replied:

'[Let not the sons of] your [house], O El,
[let not the daughters of your house rejoice,]
Let not [the children of your palace] rej[oice]!

I shall [surely] seize them in [my right hand]:
1.18 i 10 [I shall smite them by] the strength of [my] lon[g arm][124]!

I shall smite you [on] your [sku]ll:
I shall make [your gray hair] run with [blood],

the gr[ay hair of] your [be]ard with gore![125]

Then [let] Aqhat [come to you]
and let the son of [Danel] deliver you,
and let him save you from the hand of Virgin Anat!'[126]

1.18 i 15 But the Wise One, the p[erceptive] god, replied:

'I know you, daughter, that you are pitiless,
and that[127] [among goddesses there is no] contempt like yours![128]

Depart, daughter!

Ruthless (is) [your] heart:

[Sei]ze what is in your mind,
take what [is in] your heart[129]!

124. On the concept of the 'long arm' see Wyatt (1998a) and refs. See also KTU 1.3 v 23 and n. 70, KTU 1.16 vi 32 and n. 288. 'My broad grasp': Pardee (1997c: 348).

125. The opening lines are tentatively restored on the basis of KTU 1.3 v 20-25.

126. The suggestion that Aqhat could somehow rush to El's assistance is of course preposterous. Anat speaks to El with the insolence she will not tolerate from Aqhat.

127. Ug. *w*. At KTU 1.3 v 28 the text reads *k*.

128. El gives the same response as at KTU 1.3 v 27-28.

129. 'Mind... heart': Ug. *kbd*... *irt*, lit. 'liver... breast'. I have altered the organs

Let him be trampled who hinders you!'[130]

1.18 i 20 [Vir]gin Anat [departed].

Then indeed she set [her face]
[towards A]qhat the hero,

over a thousand mil[es],
[ten thousand] leagues,

and Virgin [Anat] laughed.

[She lifted up] her voice and cried:

'Listen, pr[ay, O he]ro [A]qhat!

Come[131], brother, and I shall [ ]![132]

to suit the necessary translation in psychology. But Anat does not *think* before she acts. She *feels* before she acts, for she is the very personification of human rage. Hers sounds a very modern personality. She is determined to do what is in her interests, regardless of the consequences (not unlike Aqhat). El merely concedes her autonomy. This is not to admit that the theology is morally bankrupt. It is simply a realistic theology, constructed on human experience. Cf. n. 30 to KTU 1.114.14.

130. Ultimate divine autonomy! We should remember that theology is a human construction: Anat, like any other deity, is the product of a human rationalizing of experience. Here she personifies the implacable nature of events, which pursue their own causality regardless of human desires. Aqhat has sown the wind. Now he will reap the whirlwind. El grants her complete freedom of action.

131. Ug. *at*. Dressler (1979: 216) suggests √*atw*, 'come', rather than the 2 m. sg. pron. usually understood. Cf. KTU 1.1 iii 16; 1.6 ii 12.

132. The colon is frequently restored to read *a*[*ḫtk*], to yield 'you are (my) brother, and I am [your sister]' or the like. Thus still Pardee (1997c: 348). This is then commonly explained as a formal proposal of marriage, an opening gambit in a seduction scene, or a statement of an agreement between two persons. Gaster (1961: 351 n. b) remarks of the (restored) text that ' "brother" and "sister" were common expressions for lovers in the ancient Near East', while de Moor (1965: 361), followed by Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 194) also takes it in the first sense. My reading of a colour slide of the text shows one thing for certain, that the proposed *a* some read at the end (thus *a*[*ḫtk*] in *KTU*^{2})—that is, an over-written horizontal wedge—is impossible, for what *can* be seen on the edge of the break is a *vertical* wedge. See in particular the argument of Dressler (1979), partially endorsed by Xella (1984), showing that there is no warrant in the first place for the restoration, let alone for the hypotheses built upon it. I have accepted Dressler's solution, though with Xella, I think he overstates the force of the argument from available space. Xella himself however wishes to retain the sister. Cf. Xella (1982: 203). This is not to say that there are not sexual overtones in the story. Is l. 29, for

1.18 i 25 [I] shall satisfy your desire[133]!
[from the house of ?] my father have I fled[134],
[ ]
You should come to the hunt,
[ ]
[O] happy man,
[ ]
I shall teach you how to h[unt]!
1.18 i 30 [ ] the town of Abilim,
A[bilim the town of Prince] Yarih,

instance, perhaps to be given an erotic innuendo: '[ ] I shall teach you the art of ve[nery]!'? We should remember that sexual feelings and activity and physical violence have a long joint history. The address 'brother', following Dressler's interpretation, in any event now becomes conspiratorial: Anat disarms Aqhat by pretending that all is well between them, as though they are jolly hunters together.

133. Text *šb' ṯirk*. The variety of translations shows the difficulty these words have caused: Virolleaud (1936d: 227): 'your seven meats'. Driver (1956: 57): 'with the abundance of thy meat'. Gaster (1961: 351): 'the fulness of thy flesh will I enjoy'. Jirku (1962: 125): 'full of your new wine'. Aistleitner (1964: 74): 'fill your body (?)'. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 436): 'assuage your passion' (citing Ar. *ṯawrat*, 'ardour', *ṯā'ir*, 'anger'). Similarly Gordon (1977: 18). Gibson (1978: 111): 'your seven kinsfolk', and similarly Pardee (1997c: 349 and n. 60). Del Olmo (1981a: 382): '[better for you] than seven of your relations'. De Moor (1987: 242): '[you, brin]g your seven groomsmen'. Margalit (1989a: 153): '[I know] the fulness of your "passion"'. Xella (1982: 203) leaves untranslated. It is clear that the 'brother... sister' problem of the preceding colon has guided some approaches. The question is whether such a nuance can stand when that hypothesis is discarded. I offer my translation with some diffidence. Whether the 'desire' to which Anat alludes is that of the hunt or of sexual attraction remains imponderable, and it may be justified on Ar. or Heb. cognates. The Ug. *šir* at KTU 1.6 ii 35-37 is taken to be 'flesh' by some (e.g. del Olmo 1981a: 228, 626) though I translated it as 'remains'. The present term *ṯir* is probably 'flesh' (Heb. *śe'ēr*), while *šir* is equivalent to Heb. *śe'ār*, 'residue'. See n. 84 *ad loc*. 'Flesh' may be taken as metaphorical for what is done with it (the fulfilment of passion or desire). Margalit (1989a: 324, 328) explains 'the fullness of (his) passion' as an erection. Cf. n. 11 at KTU 1.24.9.

134. The phrase perhaps hints at an intended elopement with Aqhat (cf. previous note), or may have the more neutral sense that she has gone out hunting. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 436) have 'my father, I have repelled' (Heb. *nādâ*, Akk. *nadû*). Margalit (1989a: 154): 'I am a *nadītu* [unto you]' with following '[I am truly a bri]de unto you'. But in KTU 1.16 i 29, n. 209, he regards Yasib's youngest sister as a *nadītu*-priestess, qualifying this as 'a nun...'. Or is this a nun with a problem?

whose tower [ ].[135]
[ ] their city...

(2 further illegible lines, followed by about 20 missing lines)

1.18 ii (entire column missing, about 50-60[136] lines)

1.18 iii (entire column missing, about 50-60 lines)

1.18 iv 1 [ ]
[ ] it was shattered[137] [ ]

135. The town of Abilim is proposed by Anat as the *rendez-vous* where Aqhat will await her. She is setting him up, for she will shortly (KTU 1.18 iv 7-8) instruct Yatpan to murder him there. Danel will later (at KTU 1.19 iv 1-7) curse the town for its unwitting complicity in his son's death. Text *dmgdl š*[ ]. May the broken word conjecturally be restored as *š* [*mm*], yielding 'whose tower (reaches to) he[aven]'? Only the first stroke of the putative *š* (tentatively read by *CTA*, *KTU*[1 and 2]) is present, however, and might alternatively be read as ', as for instance by Margalit (1989a: 128, 154), who on the basis of principles of alliteration restores the sequence as *dmgdl* ' [md(.) wnhrm ly]*mm*, translating 'where a tower s[tands and a river is to the ri]ght'. This seems bold to me. Cf. de Moor (1987: 243): 'the tower of which is [a thousand acres on hig]h | [ten thousand square m]iles their town', reading (de Moor and Spronk 1987: 108): *mgdl* ' [*ly.alp šd.rbt.k*]*mn.*'*r*hm, which at least has the merit of being standard formulaic language. It is however the height rather the surface area of the tower which would surely be of significance, a landmark which Aqhat would easily find. The tower might belong to a citadel, though if it does 'reach to heaven' we may detect a theological nuance and suppose it to be a temple (of the '*migdal*' or 'fortress' type of construction, associated above all with the WS world—Mari, Ebla, Ugarit, Hazor, Megiddo, Shechem, Tell Haror) whose tower serves as a landmark.

136. The figure is uncertain, being estimated on the basis of other surviving tablets associated with Ilimilku, and taking into account the size of the script and the shape of the tablet. Margalit (1989a: 154) is apparently alone in estimating KTU 1.18 i, iv to have been two sequential passages, one column on each side of the tablet. This is easily disproved by reference to the double vertical-line column-divider on the right-hand side of col. iv. Column iii would have been to its right. Note too that the edge of the tablet is on the left-hand side of both columns, which confirms the recognized numbering of the columns. For convenience see *CTA*, II pl. XXVIII, rev. (Were the lines on the left, and the column-edge on the right, we would have cols. iii and ii respectively.)

137. This is the end of a quarry in the hunt. In KTU 1.19 i 3 it will be Aqhat's bow which falls shattered (√*tbr*) to the ground (along with Aqhat, another quarry!).

[She devoured (it),] elbows, blo[od and forearms,][138]
[Vir]gin Anat surely finish[ed it off?.][139]

1.18 iv 5 Virgin Anat [depar]ted.

[Then indeed she set her face]
towards Yatipan[140], the merce[nary] warrior[141].

[She lifted up her voice] and cried:

'Let Yatipa[n[142], the mercenary warrior] remain,
[let him remain[143]] at the town of Abilim,
Abilim [the town of Prince Yarih].

Until the moon is new

The present episode anticipates the fate of both the bow and Aqhat. Matériel and people are equally vulnerable at the hands of the savage war-goddess. See also next note.

138. The text looks as though it repeats the expression found at KTU 1.5 i 5-6 and nn. 9, 10, where it is discussed. I interpret the present passage as describing Anat's treatment of a deer or other victim—see previous note. Her treatment of victims of the hunt and war was no doubt similar.

139. There is no reason to take it to be a 'human or mythical monster' with Margalit (1989a: 206) which she has presumably brought down in the hunt. Its literary significance here is that it shows the bloodthirsty and savage nature of the goddess, and is surely the type of her later treatment of Aqhat in KTU 1.19 col. i.

140. On the PN see Watson (1976c: 373). He proposes Akk. *naṭāpu*, 'to tear out', as the etymological basis, which would fit Yatipan's raptorial activity. The name might therefore, he suggests, be rendered 'Render, Ripper'.

141. Ug. *mhr št*. 'Soldier of the lady' (Watson 1976c: 373). 'Drinking soldier' (or even 'boozy soldier': soldat buveur!): Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 437). Cf. KTU 1.19 iv 53-54. I have tentatively followed the suggestion of Margalit (1989a: 337-40) who sees in *št* the sociological term 'Sutean'. However, since this text is literary, not sociological, the translation 'mercenary' is preferable, especially since it has satisfyingly pejorative tones. This soldier is a mere hireling, a brigand, like Shakespearian paid assassins. Note de Moor (1987: 244 n. 136).

142. There is no need to see an apocopated (thus *CTA*, I 85 n. 12) form of the name here, thus *yṯp*.×[ ], *KTU*^{2}. The word-divider is much smaller than others, and is probably no more than a flaw on the surface. The first stroke of the *n* is apparent. Cf. n. 150 below.

143. There is room for about 8-10 signs at the end of l. 7: Margalit's (1989a: 129) reading [.mhr.št | yṯb] (10 including word-dividers) is reasonable. 'Remain' (*yṯb*), or 'return' (Caquot and Sznycer 1974: 437 n. r). De Moor (1987: 244) construed this as referring to Aqhat: 'the hero Aqhat is staying in the city of Abiluma...' (no brackets!), restoring (de Moor and Spronk 1987: 109): *yṯb.yṯp*.a[*qht.ǵzr.b*]*qrt.ablm*. This is also reasonable, but both are uncertain.

with on [his left] ho[rn]
1.18 iv 10 and on his right horn[144]
his weakened head[145]!'

And Yatipan the mercenary] war[rior] replied:
'Listen, O Virgin Anat:

(it is) you, on [account of his bow], (who) must[146] smite him,
(who on account of) his arrows should not let him live.

The gracious one, the hero, is serving a meal[147],

144. Text *b* ×[-------] | *bqrn ymnh*. Thus *KTU* [1]. *CTA* reads the *b* immediately before the break. *KTU*[2] reads the × as q: *b* q[rn šmalh] | *b qrn ymnh*. This is to understand a reference to both horns of the new (crescent) moon. See also de Moor and Spronk (1987: 109), who restore q[*rn.ydh*] ('the h[orn of his (left) hand]'), and de Moor (1987: 244, 'left side...right side'). I see no reason for the restoration. Margalit (1989a: 129, 154) restores *bn*[yr.qṣh]...: 'when [its tip glo]ws | when its right-corner shines'. This all seems rather subjective.

145. Tentative. Or: 'manlike head'? Cf. discussion in Dietrich and Loretz (1985) and Caquot (1990: 75-76). While the lacuna remains a problem, *banšt* [ ] *qdqdh* may refer to a 'weakness of...his head', referring to the darkened disc of the moon. See also Pardee (1997c: 349 and nn. 66-68). The passage undoubtedly refers to some celestial or meteorological condition at the new moon, when the crescent is smaller, the horns being sharper, and the night darker. A dark night for a dark deed! Dietrich and Loretz draw attention to *Enuma Elish* 5.14-18, which describes the phases of the waxing moon, and refers to its two horns during the first six days of the lunation. The 'head' undoubtedly refers to the darkened sphere of the moon which can be seen as a ghostly presence against the crescent. The final colon might alternatively be taken as an instruction as to what to do during the moon's darker period: 'without pity [smash] his skull!'. The term *anšt* can have the sense of being 'human' (Caquot 1990: 77), 'weak', or of 'enraged, pitiless' (*anš* of Baal: KTU 1.2 i 38 and n. 114; *anšt* of Anat, KTU 1.3 v 27 and n. 71, 1.18 i 16).

146. The precise nuance of the vb is variously understood: e.g. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 439): 'it is you who will...'; Gibson (1978: 112): 'you yourself should...'; del Olmo (1981a: 384): 'are you going to...?'; de Moor (1987: 245): '(now) you can...'; Margalit (1989a: 155): 'you would...'. At this stage it appears that Yatipan is acting as the goddess's *agent provocateur*; only later will he become her assassin.

147. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 438) understand Yatipan to instruct Anat to prepare a meal; Margalit (1989a: 155) has Yatipan prepare a meal, taking the reference to the hero (sc. Aqhat) with the preceding words. Others understand it to be Aqhat, who is perhaps feasting after a successful hunt. 'Meal': Ug. *ṯrm*. See *UT*, 506 §19.2745 and note *lḥm* || *ṯrm* at ll. 19, 29-30 below. 'Bulls': del Olmo (1981a: 384).

1.18 iv 15 and [ ] I shall remain[148] among (his) tents
and we shall celebrate [ ].[149]'

And Virgin Anat replied:

'Pay attention, Yatip<an>[150], and [I shall instruct?] you.

I shall place you as a falcon on [my] gaunt[let],
as a hawk[151] on my glove[152].[153]

148. The term *ištir* appears as a n. representing a commodity, *kd ištir* in KTU 4.290.3 being perhaps 'a jar of honey' (see de Moor 1965: 361; Caquot and Sznycer 1974: 438 with n. v): 'some honey in the tents'. But for the present context Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 195) have adopted the view of Hoftijzer (1971), translating the present passage as 'have stayed behind (*bḏdm*: 'in the encampment)' (so also de Moor 1987: 245), also citing KTU 2.32.10, where they read [*diš*]*tir* and translate 'what is owed'. (Cf. *PRU*, II: 43 §22 [RS 16.401] with fig., and Bordreuil and Pardee [1989: 122 fig. 28b, photograph].) The uncertain nature of this scant material should be noted. The present form may perhaps be related to √*šir*, 'to remain', in the Gt form, but the initial *i* can only be a 1 p. prefix. Thus also del Olmo (1981a: 384). Cf. Gibson (1978: 112): 3 p. sg. Margalit (1989a: 155,), has '*IŠTIR* in a teat', taking this to be an 'unidentified foodstuff'. 'He has stayed on': Pardee (1997c: 349).

149. Ug. *wn'rs* [ ]. The range of suggestions indicates the difficulty. Driver (1956: 57, 141): '[they shall] indeed [be tilled]' (*'rs* 'tilth', Akk. *erēšu*). Hoftijzer (1971: 363): 'We shall make a short pause' (Ar. *'rs*). Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 438 and n. x): 'we shall make some cakes [ ]'; (MHeb. √*'rs*, 'knead'). Gibson (1978: 112, 155): 'and he did grow tired' (N stem, Ar. *'arisa*). Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 195): 'let us celebrate the wedding' (Ar. *'a'rasa*), and similarly del Olmo (1981a: 384, 605), *DLU*, 90: 'we shall celebrate' (Ar. *'arasa*). I take it that the plan is to join Aqhat's hunting feast (*not* a wedding-feast!), thus putting him at ease. It seems that Yatipan is hoping for a free meal as well as a killing. Anat's counter-proposal is to take him entirely unawares from above, from where he would least expect danger.

150. Scribal error rather than hypocoristic form, with Margalit (1989a: 210). Cf. n. 142 above.

151. 'Falcon ... hawk': Ug. *nšr ... diy* (cf. Heb. *nešer, dā'â*, NHeb. *dayyâ*, Akk. *našru*, Ar. *nasr, nisr*). The terms represent 'raptor' and 'bird of prey' rather than eagles or vultures. See n. 140 at KTU 1.2 iv 15. The lexica indicate the notorious uncertainty of interpreting Semitic bird-names. The Heb. *nešer* is also undoubtedly a falcon, so that with the bull, the lion and the man of Ezekiel's chariot (all composite in form: cf. Ezek. 1.4-25 and 10.8-17; later they are differentiated as the bearers of Christ on the clipeus and still later the evangelical symbols surrounding the mandorla) they constitute four emblems of the king, all derived from Eg. iconographic tradition. In Ezek. 17.7 Pharaoh is *nešer gādôl*: 'great falcon' (sc. Horus),

[As] Aqhat [sits down] to eat,
and the son of Danel to feed,

1.18 iv 20 [above him] (some) falcons will hover,
[a flock of haw]ks will be watching.

Among the falcons I shall hover:
above Aqhat I shall place you.

Hit him twice on the skull,
three times above the ear.

Pour out (his) blood like a murderer[154],
like a slaughterer (you must bring him) to his knees.

1.18 iv 25 Let his life-breath go out like the wind,
like spittle[155] his vitality,
as (his) dying breath[156] from his nostrils,

while in v. 3 a similar bird appears to be Nebuchadnezzar. See also n. 236 to KTU 1.19 iii 2.

152. 'Gauntlet... glove': Ug. *ḥbš...t'rt*. See Watson (1977b: 72), followed by del Olmo (1981a: 545) who cites EA Akk. *ḫa-ab-ši*, 'arm'. See also Dietrich and Loretz (1972: 30). 'Wristlet... glove': Gibson (1978: 112, 146, 159), based on contextual grounds. Driver (1956: 57, 139 and n. 9): 'sash... scabbard', citing Eg. *ḥbš*, 'wrapper, garment', Akk. *abšu*, 'thong', and Heb. *ta'ar*, 'sheath'. Margalit (1989a: 155, 335-36, 340-41): 'girdle... pouch'. He acknowledges that there is an allusion to falconry here, but appears to envisage Anat dropping Yatipan rather as a bomber sheds its load! How one is supposed to put an eagle in one's girdle it is hard to imagine. Pardee similarly with 'belt... bag' (1997c: 349).

153. *Pace* Reiter (1990), this is *prima facie* evidence for falconry in the second millennium BCE.

154. 'Like a (certain) bird', with the following colon reading 'like a falcon(?) [lit. attacker or leaper] over his knees': Watson (1991: 360); 'like one emptying a bucket': Pardee (1997c: 350 and n. 74). While philologically possible, these seem to me to fall down on prosodic grounds.

155. Ug. *iṯl*. 'Spittle' (cf. Hitt. *išalli*): de Moor (1965: 363-64), Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 196) and Watson (1987), *DLU*, 60-61. As a body fluid this will, like blood, mucus, milk and semen, contain elements of the vitality of the individual. For it to be merely wasted is a loss to Aqhat. See Margalit (1989a: 156, 342-43) for the view that *iṯl* is a plant (Ar. *'aṯl*, Akk. *išlu*): 'his vitality, like the *IṮL*-flower'. *WUS*, 41 §473 tentatively suggests 'swarm of bees' (Ar. *ṯawl*)!

156. Ug. *qṭr*. Lit. 'smoke' (*WUS*, 275 §2404). See n. 31 at KTU 1.17 i 27 on its metaphorical usage. The present instance is undoubtedly intended to echo the usage in the list of filial duties. The son's task is to ease the passage of his father's *qṭr* into the ground at the due end of his life. Here his own *qṭr* is being hastened thither

and also[157] his pulse[158].[159]
I shall not let him live!'

She took Yatipan the mercenary warrior;
she placed him as a falcon on her gauntlet,
as a hawk on her glove.

As Aqhat sat down to ea[t],
1.18 iv 30 the son of Danel to feed,

above him (some) falcon[s] hovered,
a flock of hawks[s] was watching.

[Among] the falcons Anat hovered[160];
above [Aqhat] she placed him.

He hit him twice on [the skull],
three times above the ear.

1.18 iv 35 He po[ured out] his blood [like] a murderer,
like a slaughter[er (he brought him) to his knees].

[His] life-breath went out like the wind,
[like spittle] his vitality,
as (his) dying breath from [his nostrils].

prematurely by Anat. Aqhat will be mourned not by a son, but by his own father. The irony is inescapable.

157. Ug. *u ap*. The *u* I take to be the initial copula, as in Heb. *û*, rather than 'or'. If this is so, its use before a glottal is noteworthy.

158. Ug. *mprh*. See Margalit (1989a: 156, 212 and n. 54) and now Wright (1994). Margalit proposes √*prr*, and compares Heb. √*pr(p)r*, Ar. *farfara*. He translates 'his convulsions'. Following Wright's discussion of the Eg. cognate *npȝpȝ* (Eg. *ȝ* often has the value of *r*) as used in the Smith medical papyrus, I have opted for 'pulse', which indicates the presence of life, like the spittle (wet), the vitality and the (dying) breath, rather than the act of dying. This seems preferable to Pardee's suggestion (1997c: 350 and n. 75): 'Thus I'll not let the soldier live on!'. He appears to accept the reading *mhrh* here and at l. 38.

159. The whole passage ll. 23-26 (‖ 34-37) is an important one for understanding Ugaritic anthropological thought.

160. Anat appears in the form of a bird (a kite?) in KTU 1.108.8 (*w'nt.di.dit.rḫpt*). See also stela RS 2.[038] (Yon 1991: 329 §9c). On the stela she is clearly anthropomorphic, like winged forms of Isis or Hathor, and there is no reason to insist that she is avian, rather than a winged woman, in the present instance. If this is the way it should be understood, we should perhaps assume that Anat was invisible to Aqhat below as she flew above.

Anat [watched?] as his pulse[161] stopped,
[she looked on? as] Aqhat [died],
and she wept[162] for the ch[ild of Danel]:

1.18 iv 40 'I understand[163]
that it was on account of your b[ow that I smote you],
[and because of] your arrows that I did not let you
l[ive]!'
And the birds[164] disappeared [ ][165].

1.19 i 1 ([Concerning] Aqhat)[166]

161. Text *mhrh*. Correct to *mp*$^{\text{l}}$*rh* according to l. 26. 'His convulsions': Margalit (1989a: 156). See n. 158. Note that Pardee (n. 158 above) appears to read *mhrh* in both instances. This is a reasonable alternative, and one of the lines requires to be harmonized with the other.

162. As soon as the deed is accomplished, remorse sets in! The sequel will show an uncontrolled mixture of savagery, tenderness and grief: the classic components of guilt! Caquot (1985: 94) speaks charmingly of Anat's 'versatility'. This is a sounder assessment than Handy's (1994: 123-25) view of bureaucratic malfunctioning. See Wyatt (1996b: 329).

163. Ug. *abn ank*. Caquot (1985: 94, 110 n. 4) cautions against interpreting this as promise of restitution (√*bny*): thus, e.g., Gordon (1949: 93), Driver (1956: 59), Gaster (1961: 355), Jirku (1962: 128), Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 440 and n. g): '*I* shall recreate', del Olmo (1981a: 386) and Pardee (1997c: 350): 'I would have made'. Gibson (1978: 113): '[(Life for you)] I would have created', followed by Aitken (1990: 56-57): ([*ḥym*] *abn ank*). So also Xella (1982: 205).

164. Text '*pm*m[ ] rather than '*pt*.m[ ] of *KTU*^{2}.

165. Provisional. See Caquot (1985: 94-95) for discussion of the colon. His estimate that this is 'a bundle of uncertainties' is sound. Of his further view that a further tablet may have intervened between this tablet and KTU 1.19 I am not so sure. Aqhat is freshly dead in KTU 1.19 i, and to presume further intervening adventures of Anat within the crisis of the narrative is implausible.

166. The first few lines of KTU 1.19 i are in extremely poor condition, the difficulties this entails being compounded by the number of unparalleled words, making a coherent sense based on known lexemes a hazardous enterprise. Del Olmo (1984: 125) warns against facile reconstruction, while Renfroe (1992: 119-20) writes of 'the questionable usefulness of modern Ugaritic composition' in comparing the translations by de Moor (1987: 247) and Margalit (1989a: 157; cf. 1995: 228). I offer an attempt at the passage with the diffidence such a caution demands. Particularly useful for this difficult section, in addition to del Olmo's, are the studies of Caquot (1985) and Cooper (1988). Note also Pardee's remarks (1997c: 350 n. 81).

[The bow of Aqhat] came down[167] into the midst of the
waters;
[the arrows of the hero] fell into the depths[168].[169]
Shattered was the bow[170] [of Aqhat the hero?],

167. The first seven lines are exceptionally indistinct, with a square area of text missing from the middle. The surrounding signs are generally indistinct. Virolleaud (1936d: 125), reads [ ]*kr*(?)*b*.[ ], while the transcription (pl. I), reads one horizontal stroke (the lower of two?) followed by k, another k or r and perhaps b followed by a word-divider. None of these should be written in italics, since their status is uncertain. *CTA* reads [t]*krb*., and *KTU*[1 and 2] *tkrb*. De Moor and Spronk (1987: 111): tkr*b*., and Margalit (1989a: 131): *tkrb*.. (In each case I indicate the word-divider here.) In view of the uncertainty of the reading and the expectation of a word parallel to *tql* in l. 3, I am inclined to accept tentatively the trd (in Rom.) proposed by Driver (1956: 58) and followed by Gibson (1978: 113). A colour slide does not give a certain reading, but the **b* is written across a superficial crack, which in my view bisects the third (central) vertical stroke of a *d. This means that at least the sequence **rd* is preferable to **rb*. Del Olmo (1984: 130 n. 293) suggests that the √*krb* does not occur in Ug., and is followed by Cooper (1988: 20). Cf. Caquot (1985: 96).

168. Ug. *lb*. Lit. 'heart'. Referring to the parallel 'waters': del Olmo (1981a: 386). Cf. *lēb-yām* in Exod. 15.8. In that context the term may almost have its anatomical force.

169. Given the lacunae, the restoration of this bicolon remains provisional. But this approach, also taken by Gibson (1978: 113) and del Olmo (1981a: 386), is consistent with the following bicolon which apparently describes the destruction of the bow. The two bicola make further sense as the first object of Anat's attention. She turns to Aqhat only when her first concern is shown to be a false hope. The restorations of de Moor (1987: 247) and Margalit (1989a: 156) are implausible, and in Renfroe's view (1992: 119-20) incautious. Striking the right balance with such intractable materials is extremely difficult. But simple minimalism is not likely to further our understanding. There is room for possibilities to be raised in the absence of certainties.

170. Caquot (1985: 96) prefers to think that Anat broke the bow (active vb) out of spite at being unable to string it. On the present interpretation, the goddess is thwarted by the bow falling to the ground. This perhaps better explains the savagery of her immediate attack on Aqhat's corpse. She blames *him* for it! This is after all the logic of the warmonger, of whom she is patron goddess: he attacks his enemy because his enemy would not cede to his demands, and then blames him for provocation. The goddess's behaviour is almost the paradigm.

1.19 i 5 shattered was 'Precious',[171] [the bow of the son of Danel].

Virgin Anat [came back?],
[the Beloved of the Powerful One[172]] returned[173].

She picked up[174] the quiver[175]
[ ][176] in his hands,

171. Text: *yṯbr ṯmn*: 'shattered his eight [arrows]': de Olmo (1981: 387). I tentatively take *ṯmn* to be the name of the bow (see n. 70 at KTU 1.17 v 2). Note that the bow (f.) is subj. of *ṯṯbr*, while its name (m.) is subj. of *yṯbr*. Watson (1996a: 80-81) proposes 'gift' on the basis of Akk. *šummannu*, 'gift, present'. I find this attractive. It would also conform to the gender matter just noted. For another view see Pardee (1997c: 350 n. 80).

172. There is just room for the seven signs of *ybmt limm*, (and [*n*], n. 173) despite the allowance in *KTU*^{2} of only six signs overall. Cf. del Olmo (1981a: 387; 1984: 128 and n. 288). It remains conjectural, however. Virolleaud offers no guide, *CTA* six spaces. Margalit (1989a: 157) construes differently.

173. '[Came back]... returned'. Text [ ]... *ṯṯb*. Del Olmo (1984: 128; cf. 1981: 387) restoring *wt'n* in the lacuna, reads 'Virgin Anat [replied]... repeated', and takes the immediate sequel to be a speech by the goddess. I understand her to return at this juncture to the scene of the crime (like a dog to its vomit!), where she now picks over the fragments of bow and Aqhat, and becomes maudlin.

174. Text [ ]*ša*. The fin. vb with Anat as subj. would be *tšu*. I take this to be the narrative use of the inf. abs., [*n*]*ša* (Heb. *nāsâ*): *UT*, 80 §9.29.

175. Ug. *tlm*. For this sense see del Olmo (1984: 128 n. 289), followed by Cooper (1988: 21), citing Heb. *t^{e}lî*, Akk. *tillu* and Aram. *tly*. 'She struck' (√*hlm*): Virolleaud (1936d: 135) and Caquot (1985: 98-99). 'Hills' (with some hesitation): Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 441). Cf. *WUS*, 325-26 §2760. 'Mountain': Margalit (1989a: 157). Caquot (1985: 98-99) also notes Heb. *telem*, 'furrow'. The translation remains provisional, depending on the force one gives to Caquot's observation (1985: 99) that Ilimilku has left a considerable gap at the end of l. 6, thus separating [*t*]*ša* and its putative subj. *tlm*. But it would be hazardous to read too systematic a reason for this space on the tablet. Was the subj. of the vb intended (e.g. *btlt 'nt*) but not written on account of a minor distraction? We could speculate for ever. Caquot's translation is attractive: 'Her hand struck like... her fingers (struck) like a singer (strikes) the lyre'. I might be tempted to follow Caquot here, but it would leave the [ ]*ša* without a context. Besides, his translation gives no clue as to what Anat is actually doing. The suggestion of Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 197): 'Raise, furrow, the cry: "How bitter!"' (for *ša tlm kmr*) looks rather desperate.

176. Text *k*mr[ ]: *KTU*^{2}. Virolleaud (1936d: 125) read *km*[*r*(?)..], *CTA km*[---?]. The k is also uncertain in my view. Margalit's (1989a: 131) restoration is intriguing: *km* (.) *ṯ*[u]*m̓*... This would by no means fill the lacuna, and—to follow the conjecture—we might on this basis read rather **rimt*, 'bull-shaped instrument'

as a singer a lyre in his finge<rs>.[177]
Like a chisel was her mouth[178]:
her teeth seized (him)[179]
and she devoured[180] his [en]trails?.[181]

providing the parallel term to *knr*, though reversed from the usual order (as in KTU 1.101.16-17, which fixes the order for 1.3 iii 4, 1.7.22).

177. Anat delicately, fastidiously, lovingly picks up the pieces of bow and quiver... 'His hands... fingers': applying the suffix to the singer of the simile. Alternatively, applying the simile more directly to Anat, 'her hands... fingers'. On this broad approach see Cooper (1988: 22).

178. Ug. *kḫrṣ abn ph*, construing the first two words together ('like an instrument of stone'—sc. a stone-working tool), following Caquot (1985: 100-101) rather than the second two 'stones of her mouth', sc. teeth, as Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 441), Gibson (1978: 113) and de Moor (1987: 248). Cf. Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 197): 'his mouth-stones are decaying | his teeth are affected' (*tiḫd šnth* following) seems to have no serious contextual sense, except as a portent of the future rotting of the vegetation. To *ḫrṣ* cf. rather Heb. *ḥārîṣ*, 'sharp instrument', and see the verbal form below, l. 10 and n. 182. Thus Dietrich and Loretz (1978b: 196), apparently endorsed by Caquot (1985: 100). The delicacy of her handling of the shattered bow contrasts with Anat's treatment of the shattered Aqhat!

179. Ug. *tiḫd*: lit. 'seized'. No obj. is given, and technically the vb governs the 'entrails' of the following colon, the obj. of both vbs. I have rephrased in translation for euphony. Or: 'her teeth seized his entrails and she devoured them'. Margalit's (1989a: 157) understanding that 'she grasped his teeth' (a necrophiliac dentist?) as part of a mortuary rite (see his further translation) is quite unconvincing.

180. Text *wakl* accepted from Virolleaud (1936d: 125) through to *KTU*^{2}. Narrative inf. abs., or possibly, regrouping the *w* as *kt*: *kt* ˡ*akl*: 'she indeed devoured'. We would however expect **tikl*. Margalit (1989a: 131, 157, 218 and n. 21) proposes a more radical regrouping: *p*ˡ*t*ˡ*n*ˡ*kl*: 'and she extracted (his teeth)'. This might be the more compelling if the analogy of the Jericho skulls were to be taken seriously. See preceding note.

181. Anat's mood changes abruptly as she seeks someone to blame for this catastrophe. Cf. n. 170 above. Why, it must have been Aqhat's fault! But she will make short work of him, punishing him even when dead, by devouring him, and thus preventing his burial. A sexual frisson is also surely present here. 'Entrails': tentatively reading m'*mm* (Heb. *mᵉʿîm* [pl. of *mᵉʿâ*], 'intestines, bowels') rather than *š* (?)*mm* of Virolleaud (1936d: 125), where only the final stroke of the putative *š* is given on the transcription, pl. I. *CTA*, followed by *KTU*$^{1 \text{ and } 2}$, reads *bqmm*, interpreting this final stroke as the wedge-stroke at the end of the q. A large vertical crack, bisecting the upper half of KTU 1.19 at this point, has obliterated the beginning of the sign, and Gaster's (1950: 452) proposal, *b*[*m*]'*mm*, followed by Driver (1956: 58: *b*'*mm*) and del Olmo (1976: 240-41 n. 40; 1981: 387, 618) and adopted

1.19 i 10 She cleft him[182] like the heart of a terebinth[183],
and cut the cadaver in two[184].
She divided his cadaver,
She dismembered[185] Aqhat.[186]

here, is no less likely (*pace* Herdner, *CTA* i 87 n. 3), and has to be judged in any event on context rather than epigraphy, since the latter allows all three options. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 441): 'she devours the adversaries', on reading *bqmm*, but why pl.?

182. Ug. *tšthṛṣ*. The word-divider of *KTU*[1 and 2] (*tšt.ḥṛṣ*) is unwarranted. Virolleaud (1936d: 125) and *CTA* invite this error by leaving a 'hermeneutical' gap. I take this to be 3 f. sg. Št of √*ḥṛṣ* (Heb. *ḥāraṣ* occurs only in qal and niph.). Cf. Caquot (1985: 100). On the divided form it might alternatively be construed as 'she set (i.e. applied) a chisel'. Cf. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 442): 'she chops in pieces...'. Del Olmo (1981a: 387) divides the words between two cola.

183. Ug. *klb ilnm*. Again, there is no word-divider (as given by *KTU* [1 and 2]), though Virolleaud (1936d: 125) and *CTA* leave a space as before. Many have understood there to be an allusion to an Ugaritic prototype of Cerberus here (thus, e.g., Caquot and Sznycer 1974: 442; del Olmo 1976: 240; 1981: 387; Caquot 1985: 100) and Margalit (1989a: 350). But at KTU 1.3 iii 45 (and n. 52) the dog is female, and the pl. of *iln* is *ilnym* in all its other occurrences, at KTU 1.3 iv 35; 1.6 vi 46; 1.20 i 2; 1.21 ii 4. Margalit's (1996: 157) 'in accordance with the wishes of the chthonics' (similarly Pardee 1997c: 351) is unconvincing, and partly for this reason. Cooper (1988: 20) has 'a stag's (alt: a ram's) innards'. I believe that Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 197) are right to take *ilnm* to refer to trees. Cf. Heb. *'allôn*, 'oak', *'ēlôn*, 'terebinth'.

184. Ug. *wṯn gprm*. The range of interpretations indicates the difficulty. Many leave untranslated. 'And declares [*sic*] "Who has subdued him...?"': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 442; Akk. *guppuru*, 'dominate'). 'And two heroes recite': Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 197, 199; Akk. *gabru*, *gapru*, 'strong, superior', Heb. *geber*, *gibbōr*, 'young man, hero'). 'And twice she attacked': del Olmo (1981a: 387, 534, 1984: 129; Akk. *gapāru*, 'attack'). *DLU*, 149 cites Akk. *guppuru* (*AHw*, 281) and *gubburu* (*CAD*). 'And the instructions of the Nethergods': Margalit (1989a: 157, 348 and n. 15; 'those of the pits', Ar. *jafr*, *jufrat*, 'cavity'). Cf. *WUS*, 68 §689. 'And she cuts his carcass in two': Cooper (1988: 20). He cites Ar. *jufrat*, 'chest cavity, middle of (a horse's) body', *jafīr*, 'carcass'. *ṯn* parallel *mn*: 'cut in two... divide'.

185. Ug. *šr*. Cooper (1988: 20, 22) proposes 'she splits Aqhat down the middle' (Ar. *sarra*, 'cut the umbilical cord...'). This is attractive, in that it completes a tetracolon, a particularly graphic way of representing the *total* carving up of the hero, a semantic rectangle in miniature! I have chosen to adopt Cooper's alternative suggestion, which I think is even better: he cites Ar. *šarra*, 'to expose meat (for drying in the sun)'. This still completes a fourfold process (carving three times followed by this action), and I have taken it as metaphorical for more general exposure, but with overtones of dismemberment from its juxtaposition to the previous

'He was put down[187] like a mighty serpent[188],
like a huge viper[189] in a sheepfold,

actions. Not only is Aqhat now unable to perform the burial rites on his father, but no one will be able to perform them on him. This fulsome revenge is a severe case of overkill! It will also allow the mother of the falcons to eat his scraps. Some other interpretations: 'Prince Aqhat': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 442) followed by Caquot (1985: 102). 'His heroes (*gprh*) sing about Aqhat': Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 197). Syntactical break: 'the prince. Aqhat was felled...': del Olmo (1981a: 387). 'Aqhat beheld': Margalit (1989a: 157, 353; Heb. √*šwr* 'see' || '*n* in l. 12).

186. The translation of these lines is provisional, and offered with due diffidence. It seems that the sequence is the antitype to Anat's apparent devouring of her victim in the hunt in the opening lines of KTU 1.18 col. iv. See n. 138 *ad loc.*

187. Text *y'n*. This can hardly mean 'he said', for Aqhat is dead, and Yatipan appears to be absent from the present scene. Error for *t'n*, with Anat as subject? 'They call out' (sc. their two putative heroes): Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 197) followed by de Moor (1987: 248). Del Olmo (1984: 127) notes that the beginning of a speech formula would be *wy'n* PN (in Anat's case *wt'n 'nt*). Cf. *tphn* where we might expect *yphn* at KTU 1.19 ii 27. Following Gibson (1978: 114: 'humbled') he therefore proposes seeing here √'*ny* III, 'be bowed down, afflicted' (BDB, 776). So also Cooper (1988: 20, 'abased'). I have followed this suggestion, but not del Olmo's syntax, since with Cooper I take *aqht* with the previous colon. Since Aqhat is not merely humiliated, but murdered, 'put down' seems *le mot juste*, since it has both nuances. Margalit (1989a: 157) has Aqhat the subject, now in the underworld: 'From his grave-pit. Aqhat beheld...'.

188. Ug. *kmr kmrm*. I have taken the second *k* to be dittographic. Alternatively the entire second word is dittographic. The form **kmr mrm* would have the superlative sense (as in Heb. *qōdeš haqqᵒdāšîm, šîr haššîrîm*). See also *'dmt 'dmt* at KTU 1.161.17. Wilfred Watson has suggested to me that the text as it stands, retaining the *k*, means 'like a snake, yes, like a snake', the *-m* being a conventional element when a word is repeated. For the sense of 'serpent' for *mr* see del Olmo (1984: 127 and n. 285: parallel *ap'* in following colon), followed by Cooper (1988: 20, 22), though his 'like a...snake, like two snakes' is unconvincing. Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 197) followed by de Moor (1987: 248): 'how bitter, how bitter!'. Margalit (1989a: 157): 'he perceived the heart of darkness'. Pardee (1997c: 351): 'like a veritable fugitive'. These also lack conviction. Discussion in Caquot (1985: 103).

189. Ug. *kap'.il*. Most take *ap'* to mean 'serpent', 'viper' or the like; e.g. Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 197) followed by de Moor (1987: 248); del Olmo (1981a: 387, 517; 1984: 127); Caquot (1985: 104); Cooper (1988: 20) and Margalit (1989a: 157, 353): cf. Heb. *'ep 'ê*, Ar. *'af'a*. The *il* is the superlative usage. Pardee (1997c: 351): 'vicious viper'. Driver (1956: 59, 136 n. 4, 162 n. 24), followed by Gibson (1978: 114): 'Surely I gave a cry (like) a ram' (*k* emphatic, √*p'*, 'bleat' and *il*, 'ram'). This lacks any prosodic plausibility.

(like[190]) a dog deserving a stick[191] I smote him.

1.19 i 15 Now because of his bow I smote him;
on account of his arrows I certainly did not let him live[192],
yet his bow has not been given to me;
and because of [his] death [the is] atrophied[193],

190. The *k* is perhaps haplographic. Cf. del Olmo (1984: 128 n. 287), Cooper (1988: 20).

191. Ug. *lḫth*. For this sense see de Moor (1987: 248 and n. 165). Less probably, 'because of his sin': Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 197) followed by de Moor (1987: 248 n. 165 as a second suggestion), emending text to *lḫt<i>h*. 'For its stick': Driver (1956: 59), Gibson (1978: 114), Cooper (1988: 20). 'At his sceptre(-side)': Margalit (1989a: 157). I have no idea what this means. The sequence *bgdrt klb lḫth* is read as 'in the dog's prison, look at him then' by Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 442 and n. r; Akk. *ḫâṭu*, *ḫiâṭu*, 'observe'). Caquot (1985: 105) modifies this to 'his sceptre has kept him in a prison'. Aqhat really *is* in the dog-house on these interpretations!

192. Ug. *laḫw*. Driver (1956: 59): 'but verily I will surely revive him'. This seems to fly in the face of the sense of the context.

193. Text *wbmt* ××*ḫmṣ*×× (colour slide). The *ḫ* may be a *ṭ*. Virolleaud (1936d: 125), followed by *CTA*: *w bmt* [ ]*ḫ*(?) *mṣṣ*(?) [ ]*t* (?). *KTU*[1]: b*mt*(?)×*ḫ**m*ṣṣr** (?)×(?). Apparently with increasing confidence in a continuous reading: *KTU*[2]: *w bm*th.*ḫmṣ ṣrr*. No clear sense can be made. Margalit (1989a: 131, 157, 219, 353-54), restoring *wbm*[h.y]*ḫmṣ*(.)*ṣr*[*ḫ*], has 'and behind there loom[ed] a to[wer]'. He has understood ll. 11-17 to be a description of the underworld into which Aqhat has fallen. Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 197) followed by de Moor (1987: 248 and n. 166) have 'and because of his death the sprouts turn sour' ('and through [his] death the young ear of corn is parched'), understanding the seasonal interpretation to apply to the episode. See also de Moor (1988b: 66-67): here de Moor argues that a sirocco in late spring is causing the drought. It seems to me that such a rationalizing hermeneutical programme actually does a serious disservice to the real literary and theological nature of the narrative. If, for the sake of argument, we accept the translation, which I am happy to do provisionally, it is adequately explained by the fact that a murder causes cosmic mayhem in the environs (*à la* Deut. 21.1-9, a text prescribing an apotropaic rite to prevent precisely this danger). The vb [*y*] *ḫmṣ* is better explained, following de Moor (1988b: 67) by reference to Ar. *ḫmṣ*, 'to be roasted, dried up' (‖ *y*[*bl*], 'to be shrivelled': see next note). We may even draw conclusions about the time of year of the narrative events from the vocabulary, but that is a far cry from endorsing the view that the story is telling us something about agricultural cycles and their rituals. There is no point in having a drought in winter: its effects are not so graphically obvious.

the first-fruits of summer shr[ivelled][194],
the ears of corn in their husks.'

1.19 i 20 Then Danel the man of healing,
at once the hero, the devotee of *Hrnm*, arose

[and sat by the entrance to the g]ate,
[ben]eath [the trees[195] which were by the threshing-floor].

He tried [the case of the widow],
1.19 i 25 [he] judged [the cause of the orphan].

[ ]
[ ]
[ ][196]

[On l]ifting up her eyes she saw[197]
1.19 i 30 [that the fleece[198]] on the threshing-floor was dry,
that the [ ] was wilted,
that the fruit of the orchard was shrivelled.

Over her father's house some falcons hovered,
a flock of hawks was watching.

Pughat wept in her heart,
1.19 i 35 she cried in her liver[199].

194. Reading uncertain. Virolleaud (1936d: 125): *y*[*bl*(?).]. *CTA* *y*[ ], but (n. 6) tending to accept Virolleaud's proposal. *KTU*[1] *yḥ**, *KTU*[2] *yḥ*. Margalit (1989a: 132) accepts this reading. A colour slide shows a left-hand vertical wedge following the *y*, which seems to preclude a *ḥ*. But its reading as a [*b*] remains hypothetical. Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 200) postulate *yb*[*l*] from √*nbl*, Heb. *nābal* (*sic*, perhaps *nābēl*), 'sink, languish, wither' (BDB, 615), Akk. *abālu*).

195. Text [*t*]*ḫt* [*adrm*], restored from parallel at KTU 1.17 v 6-7.

196. Ll. 26-27 and most of 28 are missing, but unlike ll. 22-25, which can be restored with reasonable confidence, these cannot be. For different reconstructions see, e.g., *KTU*[2] and Margalit (1989a: 132). *CTA* leaves blank.

197. Text *tphn*. I take it that Pughat is the subj.: she would have been mentioned in ll. 25-28 (see *KTU*[2] reconstruction), and this is supported by reference to *abh*, sc. 'her (Pughat's) father' rather than 'his (Aqhat's) father' in l. 32. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 443, n. z) explain as 3 pl. with *'nh*, 'his eyes' (not clear from the French ses yeux) as subj. But 'eyes' are du., not pl. Cf. n. 218.

198. Following Margalit (1989a: 158). See n. 208 below.

199. Margalit (1989a: 11) draws attention to the inner nature of Pughat's weeping: 'she is *stifling* sobs!'. Cf. Pardee (1997c: 351). This is Pughat's instinctive emotional reaction to what she sees. Nothing shows outwardly. The poet is attempt-

She tore the garment[200] of Danel the man of healing,
the cloak of the hero, the devotee of *Hrnm*.

Then
1.19 i 40 Danel the man of healing cursed[201] the clouds,
which rain on the dreadful heat[202],

ing to analyze her reaction. Cf. the similarly internal nature of various laughter episodes, at KTU 1.3 ii 25-26 (Anat), and 1.12 i 12-13 (El). Contrast El's public laughter at KTU 1.4 iv 28-30, and Anat's at 1.4 v 25. Cf. n. 211 below.

200. Pughat, who has spiritual gifts (see at KTU 1.19 ii 1-3, unless these be merely agricultural skills), immediately discerns that some dreadful event has occurred, and anticipates the mourning she will have to observe by this ritual and symbolic gesture. Reading the text as we have it, there is no evidence that either she or Danel knows that Aqhat is dead. Just the sight of the birds is enough to awaken her worst fears. It is possible, however, that Anat's words in the beginning of the column are not merely a soliloquy, but a confession, perhaps addressed to Pughat, who would then indicate to Danel through a wordless gesture that she had bad news for him. Against this, however, is the inner nature of her emotions (previous note), which tell against her having more than a premonition. The vb here is *tmz*', which Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 201) take as a rare 3 m. sg. form and translate as 'was rent'. But the subj. being the f. n. *kst*, it is hard to appreciate their point. Cf. n. 218 below. Dijkstra and de Moor further reject a 3 f. sg. interpretation, with Pughat as subj., on the ground that mourners rent their own garments. (Del Olmo 1981a: 388 also treats it as passive.) However, Danel is not yet in mourning, and this translation requires an impersonal sense, in which the garment for no obvious reason tore spontaneously. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 444 and n. d) translate the vb as a 3 m. sg. form, explained as an internal deponent on the model of Ar. *maza'a*, 'tear'. Margalit (1989a: 158) translates it as 'fluttered', in which case no question of tearing arises.

201. Ug. *yṣly*. *WUS*, 266 §2317, 'pray'. On the nuances Watson (1976c: 377), del Olmo (1984: 132-35), Margalit (1989a: 368-70) and Pardee (1997c: 351 n. 95). De Moor (1987: 250): 'adjured', with all Danel's speech as a series of questions. Margalit (1989a: 158): 'did entreat the clouds anxiously', with an ambiguous treatment of the sequel, half question, half curse. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 444) produce a text with inner contradictions, as shown by Watson.

202. A difficult sequence: *b ḥm.un.yr*. As translated above it is a clause qualifying the previous one; alternatively, it is a parallel colon: 'he cast a spell on the dreadful heat'. I have taken *yr* as narrative inf. abs. Above, it has its common sense of 'rain' (parallel *tmṭr* in following colon) with the clouds as subj.; in the alternative suggestion it would have its more radical sense of 'throw, cast', with Danel as subj. Margalit (1989a: 371-73) has some apposite discussion on *yr*. Cf. de Moor (1987: 250). On the expression *ḥm un* see del Olmo (1984: 134-35), and for *un*, Margalit (1989a: 370-71; 'affliction, sorrow'). Pardee (1997c: 351): 'the heat of the season'.

the clouds which rain on the summer-fruit,
the dew which settles on the grapes:

'For seven years Baal shall fail,
for eight, the Charioteer of the clouds!

No dew,
no rain,
1.19 i 45 no welling up of the deeps,[203]
no goodness[204] of Baal's voice[205]!

For she has torn[206] the garment of Danel the man of healing,
the cloak of the hero, the devotee of *H*[*rnm*]!'[207]

203. This interesting formula has thrown light on the strange form of David's curse on Mt Gilboa in 2 Sam. 1.21. See Ginsberg (1938). A comparison of the texts suggests a correction to the Heb.:

Ugaritic	Heb. MT	Heb. Corrected	Translation
bl ṭl	*'al ṭal*	*'al ṭal*	Neither dew
bl rbb	*w^{e}'al māṭār 'alêkem*	*w^{e}'al māṭār 'alêkem*	nor rain (upon you Heb.)
bl šr^{c} thmtm	*ûs^{e}dê t^{e}rûmōt*	*ûs^{e}rê t^{e}hômōt*	nor rising up of the two deeps (Ug.).

The final line of the Heb. (MT 'nor fields of offerings') would on the corrected reading mean 'nor rising up of the deeps'. While MT makes a kind of sense (the 'Fields of Offering' are the Egyptian subterranean 'paradise' represented in BD 110 and its accompanying vignettes), the corrected text, like the Ug. form, represents a threefold curse against life-giving water from any of the three natural sources: dew, rain or springs. Pardee's (1997c: 351) translation as a narrative past tense weakens the force of the curse formula.

204. Ug. *ṯbn*. Or 'rain'? Thus Watson (1976c: 377 and n. 52), following Dahood (1973).

205. Sc. the thunder, which announces the return of the rains. Cf. the (sevenfold) voice of Yahweh in Ps. 29, which echoes Baal's seven lightnings || eight thunders in KTU 1.101.3-4.

206. This could be passive, but is best construed as 3 f. sg. act., with Pughat as the subject. Pardee (1997c: 352) makes this the narrative continuation: 'When she had torn the garment...'.

207. I understand the whole of Danel's speech to be in the form of a curse, in reaction to Pughat's tearing of his garment. If this sounds an extravagant response, we should recognize the powerful symbolism of her gesture, calling forth a powerful response. It may be compared to the regular submission of a lock of hair and a piece of the hem of a garment of a 'respondent' (prophet) at Mari, which provide a guarantee of the authenticity of the oracle proclaimed, precisely on the ground that these extensions of the respondent's person may be destroyed, which will in effect

Aloud to his daughter [Daniel cried]:

1.19 ii 1 'Listen, Pughat who carry water on your shoulder,
wring the dew from the fleece[208],
and know the courses of the stars[209],
harness an ass,
rope up a donkey;[210]

destroy their owner. Thus Pughat has committed a sacrilegious act. But she, being a wise and lore-learned woman, has done it in the full knowledge of its significance. The vigour of Danel's curse here also serves a literary purpose: it anticipates the greater curses which will be uttered when Danel realises what has happened, that his son and heir has been murdered and devoured. It also prepares Danel psychologically for that later catastrophe, which thus enables him to handle that appropriately later on.

208. I have accepted de Moor's (1975; 1987: 251 and n. 181) and Margalit's (1982b; 1989: 365-67) explanation for this colon. They draw attention to Exod. 16.13-14; Num. 11.9; Judg. 6.36-40. The Heb. term *ś ʿr* has the basic sense of 'hairy', so that *śāʿîr* is a hairy animal ('goat') or a demonic form ('satyr'), while *śʿōrâ* is a hairy plant ('barley'). The radical corresponds to Ug. *ś ʿr*, and Margalit suggests that gathering dew from a fleece makes better sense than collecting water for barley (watering a whole field by hand?). This is also an improvement on Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 445): 'you who collect dew for (your) hair'; 'dew for her hair': Watson (1976c: 378). The 'barley' sense is adopted by others, with some odd results. 'She who skimmed the dew from the barley' (Gibson 1978: 115; del Olmo 1981a: 389) suggests collecting drinking water, which is probably the motivation behind the fleece-technique. 'Who gathers dew for barley' (Pardee, 1997c: 352) suggests some dew-channelling agricultural practice such as was pursued in the Negev.

209. On the significance of 'knowing the courses of the stars' we have no specific information from Ugarit, but we should presumably envisage this as involving elements of astronomy and astrology, scarcely to be distinguished in the ancient world. Texts KTU 1.78 (solar eclipse?) and 1.163 (lunar phenomena) show a dimension of Ugaritic religious practice of which we know next to nothing. But the gods are stars (*kbkbm*) in KTU 1.10 i 4, and Shahar and Shalem are so identified in KTU 1.23.54 and n. 50. This suggests a dimension yet to be discovered. For general studies on ancient astrology-astronomy with bibliography see Baigent (1994) and Barton (1994). However, in view of the mundane nature of Pughat's other skills, this may mean no more than reading the agricultural seasons off from the celestial calendar. But I am not inclined to lend too much weight to this, since she is a king's daughter, and will later play the part of a warrior. She is no mere farm-girl!

210. On the technical language used here see KTU 1.4 iv 4-5 and nn. 121-22. The fact that a donkey is to be used for Danel's journey may point to his royal status. Cf. Zech. 9.9 and its notorious misapplication in Mt. 21.1-7. Do both the Ug.

put on my trappings of silver,
1.19 ii 5 of gold my fitments!'

She obeyed, Pughat who carries water on her shoulder,
wrings the dew from the fleece,
and knows the courses of the stars.

Weeping,[211] she harnessed an ass,
weeping, she roped up a donkey,
1.19 ii 10 weeping, she lifted up her father,

she set him on the back of the ass,
on the most comfortable part of the back of the donkey.[212]

<Dan>el drove (it) on[213];
he went round his heat-cracked fields[214].

A shoo[t][215] he saw in the heat-cracked field,

and the Heb. texts allude to a ritual royal progress?

211. Ug. *bkm*. Taking *-m* as adv. on √*bky*. Thus most commentators, e.g. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 446) and Pardee (1997c: 352). Presumably Pughat's inward grief (see n. 199) now becomes a public display. Cf. however Margalit (1989a: 159, 360-61 n. 13): 'silently', that is, continuing as before. This is to accept *bkm* as cognate with Ar. *bakima*, 'be dumb, silent'. It is a tempting alternative. Gibson (1978: 115): 'forthwith'; cf. Del Olmo (1981: 390, 526): 'thereupon', de Moor (1987: 252); cf. Heb. *bᵉkēn*, a late usage. The threefold repetition, which gives some prominence to the word, makes a conjunction unlikely, since it fulfils no convincing poetic function. Gibson (115 n. 11) allows 'weeping' as an alternative.

212. This bicolon occurs at KTU 1.4 iv 14-15.

213. The text reads *ydnil* here, and *ydnh* at l. 19. The former is usually corrected (*pace* Virolleaud 1936d: 150), to *ydn<.dn>il*, as proposed by Cassuto (1938). The second is read *ydn<.dn>i<l>* by *KTU*[2], *CTA* and *KTU*[1] still reading *ydnh*. The vb *ydn* is variously translated: 'directs' (Caquot and Sznycer 1974: 446); 'whipped it' (Dijkstra and de Moor [1975: 203]; note their discussion of the haplography); 'urged it on' (del Olmo 1981a: 390, 558; de Moor 1987: 252)—all Ar. *wadana*. Gaster (1961: 360): 'proceeds'. Pardee (1997c: 352): 'approached'. Margalit (1989a: 159, 223-24) rejects the alteration, appears to want to retain the *y* (his argument is obscure), and makes *ydnil* subj. of the following clause, but on the cognate *wadana* his objection (that 'judging', *ydn*, is absurd) is met.

214. Ug. *palt*. *WUS*, 252 §2184, cf. Ar. *ba'īl*, 'thin, lean', Akk. *pēlu*, 'suppress'. Discussed Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 203), Margalit (1989a: 388-89), Renfroe (1992: 159) and Tropper (1994). A recent suggestion by Watson (1995a: 224-25; 1996: 77) is 'ill-omened (land)'.

215. Ug. *bṣq[l]*. See Margalit (1989a: 389-92) for discussion.

a shoot he saw among the wilted plants.

1.19 ii 15 The shoot he embraced and kissed:

'Oh!
May this shoot rise up in the heat-cracked field,
May the shoot rise up among the wilted plants!

Plant,
may the hand of Aqhat the hero harvest you,
may it put you in the midst of the granary!'[216]

He drove (the donkey) on[217];
he went round his parched land.

1.19 ii 20 He saw an ear of corn in the parched land,
an ear of corn he saw among the withered stalks.

The ear of corn he emb[raced] and kissed:

'Oh!
May this ea[r of corn] rise from the parched land,
may the ear of corn rise up [among the wit]hered stalks.

Plant,
May the hand of Aqhat the he[ro] harvest you,
1.19 ii 25 may it put you into the midst of the granary!'

From his mouth the word had scarcely gone forth,
from his lips [his speech],

(when) in lifting up their eyes, they saw[218]

216. Danel sees the first result of his curse, still ignorant of the tragedy. He hopes that a counter-blessing will revive the shrivelling plant. But his wish that it may be harvested by Aqhat only lends greater irony: it is Aqhat's death which lies behind the drought. It would be wrong to conclude from this wish that Danel and Aqhat are simply of farming stock. It is bucolic language used of the king and his heir, for they are the true authors of bounty in the land.

217. Text *ydnh* may be retained, following the sense discussed in n. 213. Translation requires further reference to the donkey for clarity.

218. Text *wtphn*. Apparently 3 f. sg., with Pughat as subj. Thus Gibson (1978: 116), del Olmo (1981a: 391) and Pardee (1997c: 352). We should expect *wyphn*, with Danel as subj., since Pughat is not the immediate antecedent, having last been subj. of a vb in l. 10, 22 cola previously. See Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 205-206). They suppose that the present form is a rare 3 m. sg. as with *tmz'* in KTU 1.19 i 36 (but note my comments at n. 200 above). Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 447 n. z) take it as at KTU 1.19 i 29 above (see my comment at n. 197). The putative eyes are not mentioned here. A third solution to the problem is to read the vb as 3

that [ ] was not coming;[219]
two young men[220] were comi[ng forth] by themselves;
they came forth hesitantly[221].

1.19 ii 30 Smitten [twice on the s]kull,
three times above the ea[r],[222]
the locks of their heads were dis[hev]elled[223];

m. du., serving for both genders, with both Danel and Pughat, who is after all still present, as subjects. The sight of the two messengers immediately shatters the hope that Aqhat might appear, as though in response to his father's words, to fulfil his hope.

219. Text *e*(= *i*)*n*. [ ] [?] *hlk* (Virolleaud 1936d: 153; followed by *CTA*); in.š*[ ] b*(?) hlk* (*KTU*[1]); *in* š[ ] b*hlk* (*KTU*[2]). A colour slide shows no certain evidence of the *š, in my estimation. (The *h* of *hlk* could also be *i*.) Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 206), read *in* [*aqht*] *hlk*: 'Aqhâtu was not coming!'. De Moor (1987: 253) following the new reading as restored by de Moor and Spronk (1987: 113: š[*lm*]): 'there was no peace in the walking (of the two lads)'. Similarly Margalit (1989a: 134, 159, 225).

220. Ug. *ǵlmm*. Elsewhere the term *ǵlm* and its f. form *ǵlmt* have explicitly divine or royal reference, as discussed above at n. 99 to KTU 1.2 i 13. Jirku (1962: 131 n. 6) wonders whether they are divine messengers. Cf. Pardee in n. 222.

221. Ug. *yṣa wl.yṣa*: lit. 'came forth and did not come forth'. The three instances of *yṣa* in ll. 28-29 are all narrative inf. abs., with the young men as subj. De Moor (1987: 253) draws a contrast in subj. of the two latter instances: '[Surely] they came back, but he did not come back', which implies that the two were hunting companions of Aqhat.

222. Most commentators understand this to be a description of a mime by the two young men. Thus Driver (1956: 61); Gibson (1978: 116); Xella (1982: 209); de Moor (1987: 253); Margalit (1989a: 159). Pardee (1997c: 352 and n. 103), taking this line, implies by his rubric that they are messengers of Mot. Del Olmo (1981a: 391) supposes it to be their opening words. In this case they take an inordinate time to get to the point. On the common view, adopted here, there remains some dubiety in view of the vb form *hlm*; I have understood this to be G pass. pt. du. Any active or finite verbal sense would however require the presence of a reflexive element (thus **y/thtlmn* or similar). De Moor's 'they struck' is pl., Pardee's 'he/they struck' sg. or pl. The mime would be a mixture of non-verbal communication to Danel, reflecting the messengers' distress, and gestures of mourning, in which they show solidarity with Aqhat in the particular manner of his death. We need not conclude that the messengers are miming. Rather do we have here a description of two people emotionally distraught at the news they bear, with the poet choosing his words in such a way that their behaviour unconsciously evokes the murderous activities of Anat and Yatipan.

223. Text [*wt*(?)*a*]*sr*: Virolleaud (1936d: 153); [---]*sr*: *CTA*; ×[ ]sr: *KTU*[1]; l[a]*sr*:

over the locks the band[224] [ ]
[ ] tresses,
and they poured out tears
like quarter-shekel weights[225].
They [ ] with (their) hand[226].

1.19 ii 35 Their secret overwhelmed (them)[227],
their secret overpowered[?] (them)[228]![229]

KTU[2]. Any reading is uncertain. Provisionally, 'not bound'.

224. Ug. *asr*. 'A band': de Moor (1987: 254), on the basis of a missing headband, which would have retained their hair. Unbound hair would be a sign of mourning.

225. Taking it as a fraction, with, e.g., Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 448); Gibson (1978: 116); del Olmo (1981a: 391); de Moor (1987: 254); and Margalit (1989a: 160). Unless perhaps these are 'four shekel weights'? Cf. n. 27 on the translation above at KTU 1.14 i 29-30, on the more heroic scale of Keret's weeping.

226. The *bm yd* is construed by most commentators with what follows. On Margalit's (1989a: 160) understanding, followed here, this concludes the previous colon. Margalit: 'they cla[sp the(ir) lips] with the hand' (that is, they cover their mouths in horror at the news they have to impart).

227. Reading *tliym* on the basis of Margalit's approach (n. 229 below), rather than the alternative discussed there, which would make better sense with **nliym* (as read by Dijkstra and de Moor 1975: 207; *KTU*[2]); some are victorious': de Moor (1987: 254, following de Moor and Spronk 1987: 113), reading *tliym* (vb) with Virolleaud (1936d: 153, *CTA*, *KTU*[1]). So also del Olmo (1981a: 391): 'triumph' (n.).

228. Ug *nṣḥy*. 'Is oppressive': Margalit (1989a: 160, 227). Cf. Heb. √*nṣḥ* (pi.) 'be preeminent'. Following the alternative construction outlined in the following note, 'triumph' (n.): Gibson (1978: 116, 153), 'victory': del Olmo (1981a: 391, 592); Heb. *niṣṣāḥôn*. 'If we are disgraced': Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 207)—√*ṣḥy*, 'be disgraced'; 'with[out] triumph': de Moor (1987: 254).

229. Most commentators who attempt this bicolon divide *ṣpnhm* into two words as *ṣpn hm*. This gives the following sense, open to a number of different nuances on different individual analyses:

> (It is) in the hands of Saphon if we are victorious
> in the hands of Saphon if we endure!

Let us firstly consider this interpretation. Note the invocation of Saphon as a DN (cf. KTU 1.47.[14] and parallels). The expression has the appearance of an early form of '*inshallah*!' A strength of polytheistic theology was its ability to offer a comprehensive theodicy, since various deities were responsible for different aspects of life, both good and evil. By acknowledging that a given human problem was simply, in the nature of things, the province of this or that deity, the anxiety level involved in dealing with it could be reduced. This was not a solution open to

[ ]
{'We bring you[230] news, Danel,}
{from [ ]}
{Beneath Anat he fell;}
{she felled him.}
{She drove out his life-breath like the wind,}
{like spittle his vitality[231]!'}[232]

1.19 ii 40 They arrived;
they lifted up their voices and c[ried]:
'Listen, O Danel, man of [healing]:
Aqhat the hero is dead!
Virgin Anat [drove out his life-breath] like the w[ind],

monotheistic theodicy, which has always had a peculiar moral dilemma to face, accommodating the evil in the world to the principle of a just god, as eloquently reflected in the book of Job, or in balancing the rival demands of justice and mercy, as in later forms. Saphon was an 'umbrella-deity', containing all the contradictions of the pantheon at large, but providing a short-hand synthesis of them, without the difficulties raised by strict monotheism.

Margalit (1989a: 160, 396-97) has an entirely different approach, which has the merit of reading the text we actually have, *ṣpnhm*, as *ṣpn*, n., with 3 du. suff. *-hm*. I am inclined to follow his argument, and have translated accordingly. It fits the context better, since the common view (above) represents a rather commonplace wisdom-saying which is hardly very apposite in the present context. On this understanding it is the √*ṣpn*, 'to hide', which determines the sense of the terms. Cooper's (1988: 23-26) interpretation of this passage is nothing if not original: he has Pughat grab the messengers by the 'scrota' (to Ug. *ṣpn* cf. Ar. *ṣafnu*, 'scrotum')!

230. Text *abšrkm*: the pl. suff. makes no sense, unless we suppose that Pughat is included in the address; but this is contradicted by the reference only to Danel here and at l. 41. Read **n'bšrk*?

231. 'His life-breath ... his vitality'. Text *npšhm ... brlthm*, the obvious sense of which is the *non-sequitur* 'their life-breath ... their vitality'. Cf. previous note.

232. The text of ll. 36-39, much broken, is difficult to fit into a meaningful sequence. It appears that the young men arrive and address Danel (but why the pl. suffixes?—see previous notes). But they arrive again at l. 40. Do we have here a reflection of a double recension, with both texts included? Since the former is hard either to make sense of or to reconcile with ll. 40-44, I have bracketed it, { ... }, as best left out of account in following the narrative. Margalit (1989a: 135, 160, 227-30, 381-88) has attempted to deal with the problem by splicing the two texts, but I think unsuccessfully.

like spittle his vitality!'[233]

[ ]

1.19 ii 45 [At this his feet] trembled;
abo[ve, his face sweated],
his tendons sna[pped about him],
[the tendons of his back contracted],
as did the muscles o[f his shoulders.][234]

[He lifted up his voice] and cri[ed]:

'[ ]
[ ] smite
1.19 ii 50 [ ]'

(gap of 5 lines)

edge In lifting up [his eyes he saw,]
[he caught sight of some falcons] in the clouds.

1.19 iii 1 [He lifted up his voice] and cried:

'The win[gs of the falcons] may Baal sma<sh>,[235]
may Baal smash [their pinions[236]]!

Let them fall a<t> my feet[237]!

233. *KTU*[2] reads [k qṯr b aph bh p'nm]; Margalit (1989a: 135): *ỷqḷ.l*{ }*tḥ*[*wỷ.*] *hwt*, which he labels as displaced l. 38. It does not correspond to anything in l. 38, however.

234. The formula of ll. 44-47 can be restored on the basis of parallels at KTU 1.3 iii 32-35 and 1.4 ii 16-20.

235. Text *yṯb*, here and in l. 17. Elsewhere the forms *yṯbr* (ll. 2, 8, 17, 31) or *ṯbr* (ll. 9, 22, 23, <36>, 37) appear. Most correct the first form to *yṯb<r>*. Watson (1976c: 371-72) suggests that instead of the usual explanation (√*ṯbr*, 'smash') this form (√**nṯb*) is to be related to a putative Ar. *naṯaba*, 'pluck'. Were there more examples of the spelling without *r* a case might be made, but for it to be sustained it would mean correcting several examples of the other forms.

236. Text [*diy hmt*], restored on basis of the parallel at l. 9. Elsewhere I have translated the parallel to *nšr*(*m*), 'falcons', *diy*(*m*) (KTU 1.18 iv 17-8, 20-21 etc.), as 'hawks'. See n. 151 *ad loc*. Here it is not the falcons who are smashed, but their wings. Lit. 'the pinions of them'. Since *diy*(*m*) is strictly parallel to the construct *knp*, it is appropriate to translate accordingly; the *hmt* is parallel to *nšrm*. The previous sense of *diy* was in any case strictly synechdoche. Cf. del Olmo (1981a: 384, 393), Margalit (1989a: 155, 161), Pardee (1997c: 349, 353).

237. Ug. *ṯḥ<t>*. Lit. 'beneath'.

I shall tear open [their stomachs[238]]
[and] I shall look (to see) whether there is any fat,
1.19 iii 5 whether there [are] any bones.

I shall weep and I shall bury him,
I shall place (him) in a hole for chthonian gods[239].'

From his mouth the word had scarcely gone forth,
from his lips [his] word;

(when) the wings of the falcons Baal smashed,
Baal smashed their pinions.

1.19 iii 10 They fell at[240] his feet.

He tore open their stomachs,
and [he looked].

There was no fat[241],
there were no bones.

He lifted up his voice and cried:

'The wings of the falcons may <Baal> restore;
may Baal restore their pinions!
Let the falcons flee and fly away!'

In lifting up his eyes he s<a>w,
1.19 iii 15 he caught sight of Hargab the father of the falcons.

He lifted up his voice and cried:

'The wings of Hargab may Baal sma<sh>;
may Baal smash his pinions!
And may he fall at my feet!

I shall tear open [his] stomach
and I shall look (to see) whether there is any fat,
whether there are [any bones].

1.19 iii 20 I shall weep and I shall bury him,
I shall place him in a hole for [chthonian] gods.'

238. Text [*kbdthm*], restored on basis of parallel at l. 10. Lit. 'their liver(s[!])', but hardly to be translated thus. If not the stomach, then the crop. Cf. *UT*, 417 §19.1187.

239. Pardee (1997c: 353 n. 109) identifies these with the dead and deified kings of KTU 1.113. Ug. *ilm art*. For second word read *arṣ*[!].

240. Ug. *tḥt*. Lit. 'beneath'.

241. Ug. *šmt*. Cf. *šmn*, 'oil' (*UT*, 491 §19.2439, 492 §19.2444).

[From his mouth the word had scarcely gone forth],
[from] his [lip]s his speech,

(when) the wings of Hargab Baal smashed,
Baal smashed his pinions,
and he fell at his feet.

He tore open his stomach
and he looked.

1.19 iii 25 There was no fat;
there were no bones.

He lifted up his voice and cried:

'The wings of Hargab may Baal restore;
may Baal restore his pinions:
Let Hargab flee and fly away!'

In lifting up his eyes he saw,
he caught sight of Sumul, mother of the falcons.

1.19 iii 30 He lifted up his voice and cried:

'The wings of Sumul may Baal smash;
may Baal smash her pinions!

Let her fall at my feet.

I shall tear open her stomach,
and I shall look (to see) whether there is any fat,
<whether> there are any bones.

I shall weep and I shall bury him;
1.19 iii 35 I shall place him in a hole for chthonian gods!'

From his mouth the word had scarcely gone forth,
from his lips his speech,

(when) the wings of Sumul Baa[l] <smashed>;
Baal smashed her pinions.

She [fell] at his feet.

He tore open her stomach and he looked:

there was some fat,
there were some bones.

1.19 iii 40 Then he took out the flesh[242] of Aqhat,

242. Ug. *bhm*. I accept Margalit's (1979–80: 93) proposal to see an Ug. cognate

the remains[243] he took away[244].[245]

He wept and he buried (him),
he buried him in a tomb[246] in a cemetery[?247].
And he lifted up his voice and cried

'The wings of the falcons may Baal smash,
may Baal smash their pinions,

if they fly over the grave of my son,

of Heb. *b^{e}hēmâ* here. See also at KTU 1.114.11. 'From them' (sc. the gut of Sumul) is unconvincing.

243. Ug. *llqẓ*. Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 208): reading *yb*{.}*l lqẓ* (misplaced word-divider [cf. the one at KTU 1.19 iv 8]: read *ybl.*) and considering *lqẓ* a pseudo-correction for *lqṭ*, 'gleanings, remains', cf. Ar. *laqaṭa*, Heb. *lāqaṭ*; therefore 'carried off the remains'. De Moor (1987: 258): '(he yelled, [but]) he did not wake', in Rom. as tentative). Margalit (1989a: 163, 232-33): 'he thrashed'. Pardee (1997c: 353 and n. 113): 'slept not a wink', with n. '...i.e. "observe a wake"'. The simplest solution here, though later rejected by de Moor, is the first one, involving the least manipulation of the text.

244. Text *yb*, *CTA*, with p. 90 n. 2 suggesting 'perhaps *yb'l*'. This is a tempting reading ('he brought [him]'), but previous ayins, as in ll. 37-38, are larger than the sign here. *KTU*^{2} suggests *yb<ky>*, 'he wept (for him)'. Cf. Margalit (1989a: 163, 232-33), Pardee (1997a: 353 n. 112). Cf. next note.

245. Note the folk-tale construction, in which at the third attempt Danel finds human remains, which he immediately identifies as belonging to Aqhat! Sumul's only crime is carrion-eating. I assume that she was not healed like the other falcons.

246. Ug. *mdgt*. See next note.

247. Text not certain, but *knrt* as likely as *knkt* (*knknt?*), and now adopted by *KTU*^{2}. For an exhaustive analysis of the reading of the line see Pitard (1994b), who concludes that *knrt* is certain. This is the basis for the 'Kinneret hypothesis' of Margalit (1976: 173-75; 1989a: 233-34). In terms of broad geography this is unexceptional, as there are several features of the region which are familiar to Ugaritic tradition. However, Margalit's translation of the preceding *mdgt* as 'fishpond' makes nonsense of the 'hole of chthonian gods' which Danel has repeatedly said he will use for Aqhat's burial (KTU 1.19 iii 6, 20-21, 35). It is accordingly better to understand it as a 'tomb' (cf. Dijkstra and de Moor 1975: 208; del Olmo 1981a: 395, 575; Ar. *dajā*, *dujjatu*). The old sense of 'libation-pipe' for *knkt* (*knkn*, *knk<n>t*) maintained by Dijkstra and de Moor should be rejected in the light of Pitard (1994a). Del Olmo (1981a: 566) explains the last by reference to Akk. *kankannu*, *kanāku*, *kaniktu*, *maknāku*, Ar. *kanna*, *kinnu*, *kinnatu*, and translates 'tomb'. Thus *bmdgt bknkt* would be a hendiadys. But with the reading now resolved this is superseded. The meaning of *knrt*, unless interpreted as a TN, as by Margalit, remains unresolved. Note Pitard's (1994b) conclusions. My translation is conjectural.

1.19 iii 45 if they wake him from his sleep!'[248]

Qar-Mayim[249] did the king[250] curse:

'Woe to you, Qar-Mayim,
because nea[r you] was smitten Aqhat the hero!

Be ever a supplicant in the temple,
now and forever a fugitive,
now and for all generations!'

Afterwards he took his staff in his hand;
1.19 iii 50 he came to Mararat-Tagulalu-Baniri.

He lifted up his voice and cried:

'Woe to you, Mararat-Tagulalu-Baniri,
because near you was smitten Aqhat the hero!

May your root not grow out of the soil;
may your head come away in the hand of your harvester,[251]

now and forever a fugitive,
1.19 iii 55 now and for all generations!'

Afterwards he took his staff in his hand;

1.19 iv 1 he came to the town of Abilim,
Abilim the town of Prince Yarih.

He lifted up his voice and cried:

'Woe to you, town of Abilim,
because near you was smitten Aqhat the hero!

1.19 iv 5 May Baal make your wells dry,
henceforth and forever,
now and for all generations!'[252]

248. On the motif of the dead sleeping, and the invocation of a curse if they are woken up, see the sarcophagi of Tabnit and Eshmunazar (*ANET*, 662).

249. Or: 'Waterswell': Ug. *qr mym*. Pardee (1997c: 354) translates as a neutral geographical term: 'spring of water'.

250. Ug. *mlk*. 'What pertains to you': Pardee (1997c: 354 and n. 115). See however n. 5 to KTU 1.17 i [2], n. 42 to 1.17 i 34, n. 55 to 1.17 ii 11 and n. 73 to 1.17 v 8 for circumstantial evidence in favour of understanding Danel to be a king. Margalit (1989a: 410) argues against a royal understanding.

251. See discussion in Watson (1976c: 374-75).

252. The town of Abilim is cursed last in a climactic series (note the typical

Afterwards he took his staff in his hand.

Danel came to his house,
Danel arrived at his palace.

Wailing women had come[253] into his palace
1.19 iv 10 mourning women into his dwelling.[254]

Those who lacerate[255] the flesh wept for Aqhat the hero;
they sobbed for the child of Danel the man of healing.

From days to months,
from months to years,
1.19 iv 15 until the seventh year,
they wept for Aqhat the hero,
they sobbed for the child of Danel the man of healing.

Then[256] in the seventh year
[Danel the m]an of healing spoke,
the hero, the ma[n of *Hrnm*], responded.

1.19 iv 20 He lifted up his voice and cried:

'De[part from] my [house], wailing women,
from my pala[ce], mourning women,[257]

---

three-fold series) because it is the place where the murder is carried out. See at KTU 1.18 i 30-31 and iv 8. Perhaps the legal tradition outlined in Deut. 21.1-9 lies in the background to Danel's action. Gaster (1961: 368 n. m) is undoubtedly right in pointing out the word-play between the geographical term (cf. Heb. *'ābēl*, √*'bl* II, 'meadow') which underlines this TN and √*'bl* I, 'mourn'.

253. Cf. KTU 1.17 ii 26 and n. 61 on the pluperfect sense.

254. The bicolon is an ironic echo of the arrival of the skilful goddesses (*ktrt*) at KTU 1.17 ii 26-27.

255. The form is m. Thus men as well as women act as 'professional' mourners. Cf. the prohibition on self-laceration in Lev. 19.28, Deut. 14.1, and Jer. 16.6, an indication that it was traditional practice in Israel-Judah. Cf. the ritual actions of the 'prophets of Baal' in 1 Kgs 18.28, and of El and Anat at KTU 1.5 vi 17-22 and 1.6 i 2-5.

256. I have transferred the copula *w* from the following phrase (*wy'n* [*dnil*...]).

257. A rather erratic line is scored across the column after l. 21, first noted in editions of the text by *KTU*[2]. Since it bisects a tricolon it is difficult to discern any purpose, except that it separates female from male mourners. Perhaps the line is to warn the reader to note the instruction on the lower edge 'and the recitation of this he is to repeat' (following KTU 1.19 iv 62). But this does not explain its precise location. Cf. Margalit (1984c: 178-79) and de Moor (1987: 265 n. 262).

from my dwelling, you who lacerate the flesh!'

Then he offered a sacrifice to the gods,
he offered up their[258] incense among the heavenly ones,
1.19 iv 25 incense of *Hrnm*[259] among the stars[260].

[ ] on it the hand of [ ],
[ ] cymbals,
ivory castanets [ ][261]

Then Pughat who carries water on her shoulder replied:

'Having offered, father, a sacrifice to the gods,
1.19 iv 30 having offered up <their>[262] incense among the heavenly ones,
incense of *Hrnm* among the stars,

bless[263] me, that I may go forth blessed;
give me a blessing, that I may go forth given a blessing;

that I may smite my brother's smiter,
1.19 iv 35 that I may kill my sibling's killer!'

Then Danel, the man of healing, replied:

'Let your spirit flourish, Pughat,
you who carry water on your shoulder,
who wring dew from the fleece,
who know the course of the stars,

May it go well with (you)![264]

You will smite [your brother's] smiter;

258. Possibly 'their' (*dǵthm* read by *KTU*[2]). The break in the tablet leaves what may be the horizontal stroke of a *m*. 'His': de Moor (1987: 260) and Pardee (1997c: 355).

259. Parker (1972: 101).

260. Note Ug. *kbkbm* here a designation of the gods. Cf. KTU 1.10 i 4 and n. 50 to KTU 1.23.54. See also Pughat's epithet *yd't hlk kbkbm* at KTU 1.19 ii 2-3 (with n. 209).

261. On musical instruments used at Ugarit see Caubet (1996).

262. Text *dǵth*. 'His' cannot be right when Pughat is speaking directly to Danel, since she is not addressing him in the third person. Cf. n. 258.

263. 'Father... bless me'. I have taken *ab* in l. 29 to be voc. and the vb *tbrkn* to be 2 m. sg. with Danel as subj. Similarly del Olmo (1981a: 398); de Moor (1987: 263). Cf. Pardee (1997c: 355).

264. Cf. KTU 1.17 i 38. Lit. 'may she go well!'

1.19 iv 40 you will kill your sibling's killer!'
[ ] she went down to the sea[265].
She was[hed] herself
and she rouged herself[266] with shellfish from the sea,
whose source is a thousand acres in the sea.
Un[derneath] she donned warrior's equipment:
1.19 iv 45 she put a da[gger] in her sheath;
a sword she placed in [her] scabbard.
And on top she donned women's clothes.[267]
At the going down of the luminary of the gods, Shapsh,
Pughat [reached] an encampment on the steppe[268].
At the setti[ng][269] of the luminary of the gods, Shapsh,

265. If Pughat goes to the sea, source of shellfish, it seems that the Kinneret geography is compromised.

266. Text not clear. Virolleaud (1936d: 176 and pl. IV): *wtadm te*(= *i*)(?)*dm*; *CTA* (*a*/*t*)*dm.tid*$^{!}$*m*; *KTU*^{1} w*.ṯ*k*m.tium (tidm) (followed substantially by del Olmo [1981a: 399] and Margalit [1989a: 140]); *KTU*^{2} tad*m.tium* (read *tidm*). A slide offers no certainty. The older reading seems safer, though puzzling. The parallel passages (next n.) do not describe a *rouging* to the shoulder. Do we perhaps have *tadm* (corresponding to the vocalized forms at KTU 1.14 ii 9, iii 52) subsequently corrected to *tid*$^{!}$*m*, with the error not erased? The usage is of great symbolic significance. It combines the beautification associated with Anat in KTU 1.3 iii 1 (cf. also Hurriy's make-up at KTU 1.14 iii 43-44) with the rouging performed by Keret in KTU 1.14 ii 9, iii 52. See nn. 44, 106 *ad loc*. Pughat is as far as Yatipan will perceive making herself up as a seductive woman (whether or not pretending to be Anat); the vb *tadm* however gives the reader or listener a clue to her real intention, which is violence. She has murder in her heart.

267. On Pughat's clothing see Watson (1976c: 375-76). 'Equipment...clothes': the same Ug. term *npṣ* is used in both cases. Cf. KTU 1.17 i 33 and n. 39. Note the skilful way in which the bicolon on clothing, in the form of an envelope, frames the bicolon on weapons, to make a tetracolon. Thus are the weapons concealed within Pughat's garments. Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 212) state that Pughat's intention was not to conceal her weapons, but to resemble Anat. The prosody implies a bit of both. They also note the word-pair *tḥt*...*'l*. The order enhances the element of disguise, because the earlier line (that which is on top) is *tḥt*, underneath, while the later (which is underneath), is *'l*, on top. All is not as it seems. (Gaster's [1961: 373] alteration of the line-order here to preserve a 'modern logic' misses the point, which is precisely the paradox.)

268. Hunting country. The crime was committed during a hunt: vengeance will be sweetest in similar circumstances.

269. 'At the going down.. of the setting...'. Ug. [*lm*] *ṣbi*...*lm'r*[*b*]. The two

1.19 iv 50 Pughat came to some tents.[270]
Word was brought[271] to Yati[pan]:
'Our employer has come to your tent,
[Anat][272] has come to the tents.'
And Yatipan, the mercenary war[rior], replied:
'Take this and give me to drink:
take[273] the cup from my hand,
the goblet from my right hand'.
1.19 iv 55 Pughat took (it) and gave him to drink.
She took[274] [the cup] from his hand,
the goblet from his right hand.
Then Yati[pa]n the mercenary [warri]or said:

terms are synonymous. Just as Anat had proposed a moonless night for the crime (KTU 1.18 iv 9-11), so Pughat chooses a sunless night for her revenge. Perhaps a moral opposition is intended: a criminal activity echoed by an act of judgment. The sun was widely taken as a symbol of justice in the ancient world, with sun-gods the guardians of law.

270. A second tetracolon, consisting of two interleaved bicola, almost evokes the folds of tent-fabric.

271. Note the way in which unnecessary characters in the story are kept out of the picture by the impersonal use of the vb.

272. An intriguing crux, which has a bearing on the psychology of the scene. *CTA*, *KTU*[1 and 2] restore [*pġt*], as does Pardee (1997c: 355 and n. 135), translating *agrtn* as 'our hireling'. This fits in well with the psychological position accepted by de Moor (1987: 264 n. 254). Thus Yatipan and his crew, no doubt already far gone in their cups, see a girl approaching, indeed take her to be Anat, but now consider her to be *their* employee rather than the other way round, and thus call her 'the girl' (*pġt*). Her main task now is to refill their glasses! The alternative is to restore ['*nt*], as various commentators have done (e.g. Gibson 1978: 121; del Olmo 1981a: 400; de Moor 1987: 264[!]; Margalit 1989a: 141, 165, 241). See Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 212). On this approach it is only now that with typical male swagger they insolently treat her, the goddess of war and hunting, as a mere serving-girl. This will presumably be a serious misjudgment, though of course we do not know the outcome. The choice between the two approaches is finely balanced. But Yatipan's later form of address, 'lady' (*št*), perhaps spoken with irony in the context, tilts the balance in favour of the line taken here. Jirku (1962: 136), with 'our enemy(?)' and Xella (1982: 216), with 'Anat (?)' are in doubt. Aistleitner (1964: 82) leaves blank.

273. The vb, *t*[*q*]*ḥ*, 'take', would appear to require Pughat to remove the cup from (*b*) Yatipan's hand to fill it up. The emphasis is curious. Perhaps it is to emphasise the insolence of Yatipan, who supposes the girl to be Anat.

274. Reading *t*q*ḥ* instead of *t*p*ḥ* (*KTU*[2]).

'With wine, O Lady, I am strong[275]!
(I am) the god[276] [ ]
the god who owns (these) tents!
The hand[277] which smote Aq[hat] the hero
will smite thousands of the Lady's enemies,
1.19 iv 60 working spells on (their) tents[278]!'
[ ]...
her heart like a serpent [ ][279]
With wine [she] filled him[280],
edge a second time she gave him mixed wine to drink,
she gave him to drink [ ][281].
side And the recitation of this he is to repeat.[282]

275. Ug. *ila*. Taking it as √*liy*, 'be strong' (as occurring in Baal's epithet *aliyn*). For this approach see also de Moor (1987: 264). Thus *CTA*, *KTU*^{2}. Others correct to *iln* (thus *KTU*^{1}), reading either 'our god' (thus Gibson 1978: 121 [but with text uncorrected]) or 'our Ilu' (thus del Olmo 1981a: 400). Cf. Margalit (1989a: 166, 242); Pardee (1997c: 355): 'ILA', a DN. Gaster (1961: 375) and Gibson (1978: 121) have Yatipan propose a libation here, while for del Olmo (1981a: 400) it is part of an oath by Yatipan.

276. Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 213) have Yatipan claim to be a god himself, he is so strong! This nicely parallels Pughat's disguise as Anat. I have adopted this position.

277. Sc. Yatipan's.

278. I take this colon to be part of Yatipan's boast. For de Moor (1987: 265) it is a spell cast by Pughat before she carries out her plan. The form *ḫršm* being narrative inf. abs. with enclitic, either is possible.

279. Text: p ×[×.]*ḫkm ybl.lbh.bṯn* (thus *KTU*^{2}). Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 213-14) followed by de Moor (1987: 265) take *bṯn* with the following clause ('a second time...') and read and construe the rest as p[tgm]*rm* [*y*]*bl.lbh*, 'she carried out the wish of her heart' (√*gmr*, 'to achieve, to accomplish'). Others take *lbh.km.bṯn* as I have: 'her heart was like a serpent'. Thus, e.g., Gibson (1978: 122); del Olmo (1981a: 401); Pardee (1997c: 356). Margalit (1989a: 141, 166, 242-46) takes an entirely different line.

280. The suffix *-h* can denote either Yatipan or the cup. I have chosen the option more in keeping with Pughat's intention.

281. The narrative breaks off *in medias res*. Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 213-14) detect a final *s*[ ] in the extension of the line under the end of col. iii (see *CTA*, 92 n. 4). They restore *tšqy.s*[m hwt], '*she gave* him poison *to drink*'.

282. At this point the tablet breaks off. KTU 1.20–1.22, the so-called *Rpum*-texts, are sometimes regarded as the continuation of the narrative. Cf. Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 171-72). I do not share this opinion. Cf. n. 257 to KTU 1.19 iv 21.

Part V
SELECTIONS FROM TEXTS KTU 1.20–1.169

KTU 1.20–1.22 The RPUM Texts

(KTU 1.20 = CTA 20 = 4 Aqht = IV D = I Rp = UT 121 = RS 3.348)
(KTU 1.21 = CTA 21 = II Rp = UT 122 = RS 2.[019])
(KTU 1.22 = CTA 22 = III Rp = UT 124+123 = RS 2.[024])

Select Bibliography
Virolleaud 1936c: 228-30, 1941a; Aistleitner 1964: 83-86; Caquot and Sznycer 1974: 471-80; Gordon 1977: 29-34; L'Heureux 1979: 129-59; del Olmo 1981a: 417-24; Spronk 1986: 161-77; de Moor 1987: 266-73; Pitard 1992, 1999b; Aboud 1994: 127-49; Lewis 1996a, *idem* in Parker 1997: 196-205.

These three fragments were at first identified as part of the Aqhat story (KTU 1.17–1.19), a view still maintained by de Moor (1987). They are evidently parts of considerably longer texts, and appear to be different versions of the same narrative sequence rather than complementary episodes. They deal with the journeying of the *Rpum*, deceased and deified kings, to a communion-ritual (probably the *kispum*) where it appears that their power was invoked on behalf of a new king. These texts perhaps supply the mythological background to the rites underlying KTU 1.161.

KTU 1.20
Small portions of two out of a possible six columns survive.

1.20 i 1 [The sav]iours[1] will feast[2]:
[seve]n times the divinities,
[eight times[3]] the dead[4].
[ ] as the assembly[5] draws near[6]
1.20 i 5 [ ] on a summer's day,
[the divinit]ies will eat,
[[7]] will drink[8].

1. Ug. [*rp*]*um*. Various translations: 'saviours' (de Moor), 'divine rulers' (Aistleitner), 'hale ones' (L'Heureux), 'shades' (Caquot; Lewis); untranslated (del Olmo). In view of the fact that they are apparently divinized dead kings, have a soteriological function in maintaining society, and appear, as here, in parallel with *ilnym*, 'divinities' ('minor gods'), 'saviours' seems an appropriate translation. The technical sense applied to 'heroes' in Greek cultic contexts may also be appropriate. See further discussion at KTU 1.161. These mythological texts may have a bearing on its cultic context.

2. Ug. *tdbḫn*. Taken as 3 pl. (juss.: de Moor 1987: 267; indic.: Lewis 1996a: 124, 133); or as 2 pl. (indic.: L'Heureux 1979: 130; del Olmo 1981a: 417). 'Feast', Lewis (1996a: 124); 'prepare food', L'Heureux (1979: 130); 'sacrifice', del Olmo (1981a: 417); 'take part in the sacrifice', de Moor (1987: 267). Cf. KTU 1.1 iv 28 (*il dbḫ*); 1.114.1.

3. Perhaps the numerical sequence 'seven...eight (times)' (*šb'...ṯmn*: here *šb'd...ṯmn*[*i*]*d*) was used here? Cf. l. 1 of col. ii and its putative antecedent. On the other hand the 'seven times' ([*š*]*b'd*) is hardly secure. Cf. L'Heureux (1979: 130).

4. Text [ ]*mtmtm*. The sign preceding this is read *w* by Pitard (1992: 40-42): tentatively, appealing to Virolleaud (1936c, pl. 17; Virolleaud 1941a: 2 reads as *k*), but *k* by Lewis (1996a: 124). The latter translates as 'like the ancient dead' (1996: 128). Caquot (1974: 477 and n. a): *k mt mtm*: 'when men have died'. Del Olmo (1981: 417): k*m tmtm*: 'so that when you (pl.) die'. Perhaps the cs. phrase *mt mtm*, lit. 'dead men'? Whatever the precise nuance, *ilnym* and *mtmtm* refer to the *rpum*. Cf. L'Heureux's argument (1979: 130-31) for reading *amtm*. He rejects the view that the *rpum* are *dead* persons.

5. Ug. *sd*. Or 'council' (cf. Heb. *sôd*: the only instance of this term in Ug.).

6. Reading *qrb*. L'Heureux's suggestion (1979: 130-31): *t'rb sd*: 'and you (they?) will enter the assembly' is equally plausible. If this reading were to be preferred, I would translate it as 3 p.

7. On the parallel of ll. 2-3, we should expect [*mtmt*]*m*. Virolleaud (1941a: 2) and *CTA* read [*rp*]*um*, *KTU*[2] [ ]*ym*, (cf. Caquot and Sznycer 1974: 477); del Olmo (1981a: 417) [ ]*pm*; Pitard (1992: 46) [ ] *ṯm* (*r* tentative), followed by Lewis (1996a: 124: [ ]*rm*).

8. Ug. *tštyn*. This might be divided *tšt yn*, as by Aistleitner (1964: 84): 'drank wine'.

[ ] the gods of the nut-groves[9]
[ ] which[10] is over...
1.20 i 10 [ ] slaughter of sacrificial lambs[11].
...
(uncertain number of lines missing)
'...
[...seven...in my house]
1.20 ii 1 eight within my palace[12].'

The sav[iours] hurried [to his sanctuary[13]],
to his sanctuary hurried the divin[ities[14]].

[The chariots] they harnessed;
the horses they hitched,
[ ][15].

They mounted their chariots,
they ca[me on their mounts][16].

1.20 ii 5 They journeyed a day
and a second.

9. Cf. KTU 1.24.43. The species of plant is indeterminate.

10. Or: 'who' (f. rel.).

11. Reading *imr* ('sacrificial lamb') for *amr* as suggested by Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 478). Cf. KTU 1.14 iii 56 etc.

12. If El is speaking, as suggested by Lewis (1996a: 128), perhaps 'house...temple' for 'house...palace'. Perhaps however the words are spoken by the living king? Del Olmo (1981: 417) has Danel issue an invitation to the *Rpum*.

13. Ug. *aṯrh*. L'Heureux (1979: 133): 'in its place', referring back to 'my palace'.

14. Reading *il*n[*ym*] (thus *KTU*^{2}) rather than *ilm*[ ] of Pitard (1992: 42, 45) and Lewis (1996a: 124).

15. Text dg[ ]. Restored dg[*lm.tšu*] according to de Moor and Spronk (1987: 119), de Moor (1987: 268) and Lewis (1996a: 124): '[they raised the stan]dards'. The width of the column is not certain, so such a reconstruction is hazardous. Pitard (1992: 42): bg[ ], *KTU*^{2}: b gx[ ].

16. Restored after KTU 1.22 i 23-24. Ug. *'rhm* translated 'their cities' (*UT*, 460 §19.1910, *'r* I, *WUS*, 241 §2091, *'r* II): Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 473 and n. m), 'city': del Olmo (1981a: 421); 'their stallions' (but *UT*, 460 §19.1911, *'r* II, *WUS*, 240 §2090, *'r* I, 'male ass' cf. Akk. *ḫārū*); L'Heureux (1979: 133), 'donkeys'; 'stallions': de Moor (1987: 269) and Lewis (1996a: 128). Cf. also *UT*, 455 §19.1848, *'yr* (Heb. *'ayir*). However, the presence of *sswm*, 'horses' in l. 3 above, must control the force here: 'chariots' || 'horses', 'chariots' || 'mounts'. 'Donkeys' constitutes a *non-sequitur*.

After su[nrise[17] on the third]
the saviours arrived at the threshing-floors,
the di[vinities at] the plantations.

Then Danel [the man of healing[18]] answered,
the hero, the devotee of *Hrnm*, replied[19]:

'[The saviours are at] the threshing-floors,
the spirits[20] are at the pl[antations.][21]

1.20 ii 10 Let those who have come be fed,
feed [ ]
apples...'

(rest of column missing,
together with up to four further columns entirely missing)

KTU 1.21

Part of one column, and a few letters from another, survive from a tablet of six columns.

1.21 i (only a few letters)

1.21 ii 1 '[...] my banquet[22],

17. Ug. *špšm*. 'Sunrise': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 478), L'Heureux (1979: 133), del Olmo (1981a: 418). 'Sunset': de Moor (1987: 269) and Lewis (1996a: 128). See Watson (1992a: 246). Cf. KTU 1.14 iii 3 and n. 78.

18. Ug. *mt.rpi*, as commonly in KTU 1.17–1.19. See discussion in n. 5 to KTU 1.17 i 1-2, especially reference to Annus 1999.

19. It is this reference to Danel that has provoked speculation that this narrative is linked to the Aqhat story. There may however have been various tales featuring the hero. This bicolon does indicate however that the text already presupposes other characters in dialogue with Danel, none of which survives. Del Olmo's suggestion would have Danel responding to himself(!) and thus require the verbs here to be more neutral ('said...declared' or the like).

20. Ug. *ilm*, but hardly intended (unless 1 Sam. 28.13 be adduced). Perhaps an error for *ilnym*, 'divinities'? It is a matter of rank. See n. 123 to KTU 1.6 vi 48. But cf. the use of *il* with names of dead kings in KTU 1.113 v. Caquot (1974: 478 n. g) takes *ilm* as superlative (but still translates 'the divine threshing-floors').

21. This prosody reflects the reconstruction of Lewis (1996a: 124, 128) over against del Olmo (1981a: 418).

22. Text [ ]*mrz'y*. Most have taken this to be the equivalent of *mrzḥy*, 'my *Marziḥu*-feast', 'banquet'. I accept this with some diffidence. The speaker may be the same as Danel's interlocutor in KTU 1.20.

come to my house, [saviours[23]].

[To] my [house] I invite you,
I summon [you into the midst of] my [pa]lace.'

To his sanctuary, saviours, [hurry indeed].
[to his sanctuary] hurry indeed, divinities.

1.21 ii 5 [ ] my banquet[24]
Therefore...[25][ ]
[ ] as my shepherd[26].

Now I shall journey [a day and a second];
[after sunrise on] the third I shall arrive at [my] house,
[I shall come into the mid]st of my palace.'

Then El went on:
'[ ] my [banquet],
come to my house, saviours,

1.21 ii 10 [to my house I in]vite you,
I summon you [into the midst of] my [pala]ce'.[27]

To his sanctuary, saviours, [hurry indeed],
to his [sanctua]ry hurry indeed, di[vinities].

...

(text breaks off)

(further columns missing)

KTU 1.22

A tablet originally of four or six columns. Possibly written by Ilimilku. KTU 1.22 i, ii = CTA 22 B, A, reversing the order originally proposed by Virolleaud (1941a: 12). Virolleaud's order is retained here (supposing this to be the recto of the tablet). About half the width of col. ii is missing. Some restoration is possible on the apparent parallel of KTU 1.21 ii 6-12 (see arrangement of text in Lewis 1996a: 125, 129).

23. Thus Caquot (1974: 479), del Olmo (1981a: 418) and Lewis (1996a: 125, 129).

24. Text [ ]*mrz'y*, as l. 1.

25. Text *yrp*[ ]. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 479), del Olmo (1981a: 419) and Lewis (1996a: 125, 129) read *y* (voc.) with *rp*[*um*]: 'O *Rpum*'.

26. If El is speaking (thus Lewis), perhaps this is a title of the king.

27. L'Heureux (1979: 139) includes *rpum*...*ilnym* in each colon respectively.

1.22 ii (indeterminate number of lines missing)

'...
[into the mids]t of my palace'.

[Then El went on:]
'[my banquet] ,
come to my house, sa[viours],

[to my house I invite] you,
I sum[mon you into the midst of my palace'.]

To his sanctuary, sa[viours, hurry indeed],
[to his sanctuary] hurry indeed, di[vinities].

[ ] the warrior[28] of Baal,
[the warrior of] Anat.

'Come to [my] hou[se, saviours,]

[to my house] I invite you,
I [summon you into the midst of] my palace.'

To [his] sanctuary, [saviours, hurry indeed],
to his sanctuary hur[ry] indeed, [divinities].

Yahipan[29]...
[ ]

'Listen, you, [saviours],
[divini]ties!'

...[ ]
oil...[ ]
[ ] made a vow:

'If...[ ]
...[30]

(If) he[31] ta[kes possession of the throne of his kingship,]

28. Text *mhr*. The term may be cs. pl. I have taken it as cs. sg. here and in following colon on basis of the context in KTU 1.22 i 8-9 below.

29. Ug. *yḥpn*: taken as a PN here and at KTU 1.22 i 9 by del Olmo (1981a: 421).

30. Text *'ṣ .amr. 'ṣ* ('tree', 'wood'?) left untranslated. 'Lambs' (sc. *amr* = *imr* at KTU 1.20 i 10), del Olmo (1981a: 421). Read *'l amr*: 'on the command': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 472); 'over Amurru': de Moor (1987: 270: Aqhat's kingdom).

31. For de Moor (1987: 271) it is Danel making the vow on behalf of Aqhat.

the back-rest[32], the siege of [his] do[minion][33],

[to my house] I shall invite the saviours,

1.22 ii 20 [I shall summon the divinities] into the midst of [my] pa[lace].'

[To his sanctuary the saviours] hurried indeed,
to his sanctuary [hurried indeed the divinities].

They harnessed [the] cha[riots];
the horses they hitched.

They mounted [their] cha[riots],
[they came] on their mounts.

[They journeyed a day
and a second.]

1.22 ii 25 [After sunrise] on the third
[the saviours] arrived at [the threshing-floors,]
the di[vi]nitie[s at the plantations.]

...

(rest of column missing)

1.22 i (indeterminate number of lines missing)

1.22 i 1 ...

'Behold your son,
behold [ ]
[ ]
[behold] your grandson (at) your sanctuary.
Behold [ ] your hand.

The little one your lips will kiss[34].'

1.22 i 5 There, shoulder to shoulder,
(are) the brothers who attend[35] El with alacrity[36].

32. Text *nzt*. Correct to *nḫt*. On the translation see KTU 1.1 iv 24 n. 56.

33. According to L'Heureux (1979: 145) it is 'by my royal throne...' that the speaker swears.

34. Thus Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 474) and de Moor (1987: 271). Or the reverse: 'the small one will kiss your lips': Lewis (1996a: 130). The former is more likely, as it seems to be a quasi-ritual procedure, part of the blessing of subsequent generations.

35. Ug. *qym*. Thus del Olmo (1981a: 422, 617: qattal of √*qwm* or √*qwh*) and

There mortals...[37] the name of El,
heroes... the blessing of the name of El.

There (was) Thamaq[38] the saviour of Baal,
the warrior of Baal
and the warrior of Anat.

1.22 i 10 There was Yahipan the valorous[39],
the prince of eternal kingship[40].

Just as Anat hurries to the chase,
(and) sets the birds of heaven wheeling in flight,

(so) he slaughtered oxen and sheep,
he felled bulls
and the fattest of rams,
year-old calves,
skipping lambs,
kids[41].

Lewis (1996a: 130). 'Made stand up': de Moor (1987: 271).

36. Ug. *blsmt*. √*lsm*, 'run' (Akk. *lasāmu*): Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 474 n. r) and del Olmo (1981a: 573). Virolleaud (1941a: 19) toys with the idea that *blsmt* = 'balsam' (cf. Ar. *balsamat*, 'embalming').

37. Text apparently *yṯbš* in l. 6, and *y'bš* in l. 7. Del Olmo considers the second a possible error for the first (1981: 597; cf. *UT*, 453 §19.1808); Pitard corrects first to *y'bš* (1992: 56, 57 [detailed argument] and 64 fig. 27). √*ṯbš*: 'celebrate' (Ar. *šabaṯa* with metath.); √*'bš*: 'frown' (Ar. *'abasa*). No meanings offered in *WUS*, *UT* or *DLU* (no entry). Virolleaud (1941a: 19) cites Akk. *šabāšu*, 'turn aside, be angry' and Ar. *'abasa* respectively. De Moor (1987: 272): 'the name of Ilu gave substance to the dead | the blessing of the name of Ilu gave substance to the heroes'.

38. See Aistleitner (1964: 85) and Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 475 n. u) who note that there is a PN *ṯmq*, found in KTU 4.93 iv 3 as *bn ṯmq*, which may indicate that the *ṯmq* element is the DN Shimegi, so that here it is hypocoristic: Watson has suggested to me orally that it is this DN occurring here: cf. also *ṯrmg* at KTU 1.4 viii 3. However, Shimegi appears to have been transcribed as *ṯmg* in the PN *ṯmgn* and perhaps as Syll. ŠI-*ma-ka-ya* (= *šmgy*): Pardee (1989–90: 422, 429). Del Olmo takes it as a PN (1981a: 423). This lends support to the similar explanation of *yḥpn* at KTU 1.22 ii 12 and at i 9 below. Dijkstra (1988: 47) reads 'Yahupan, the Hayilite' at i 9.

39. Ug. *ṯm.yḥpn.ḫyly*. Spronk (1986: 171) followed by de Moor (1987: 272): 'there rustled the host of the filth, the highness, the king, the unrelated (Spronk, de Moor: usurper)'. Cf. n. 16 to KTU 1.161.7.

40. Ug. *zbl.mlk.'llmy*. Cf. Lewis (1996a: 130, 139; 1989: 18): 'the eternal royal princes'. I take the line to refer only to Yahipan.

1.22 i 15 Like silver to vagabonds[42] were the olives,
(like) gold to vagabonds were the dates[43].
...[44] a table (set) with fruit of the vine[45],
with fruit of the vine of royal quality[46].
Lo,
throughout that day[47] he poured wine of Thamak[48],
the foaming wine[49] of rulers[50],

41. This formula betrays the style of Ilimilku. Cf. KTU 1.1 iv 30-32, 1.4 vi 40-43 and Lloyd (1990). Note how here the formula constitutes the climax to a Homeric simile. The subject is the host (El? the king? Danel?) rather than either of the *rpum* just mentioned.

42. Ug. *'brm*. 'Onlookers': Aistleitner (1964: 86; *WUS*, 226 §1991); 'invitees': del Olmo (1981a: 423), *DLU* (p. 71); 'travel(l)ers': L'Heureux (1979: 153) and Lewis (1996a: 131); 'those who came over' (sc. the dead): Spronk (1986: 275) and de Moor (1987: 272). I have linked the term to Heb. *'ibrî*, Akk. *Ḫabiru*, Eg. *'apiru*, heterogeneous groups who appear as mercenaries, raiders, herdsmen. The point of the simile is irresistibility. The other suggested translations make weak comparisons.

43. Ug. *kš*. 'Dates', del Olmo (1981a: 569, citing Ar. *kuššu*, *kasīs*). 'Cassia petals', Aistleitner (1964: 86, *WUS*, 157-58, 226 §§1392, 1991: cf. Ar. *kissatu*, Akk. *kašû*). 'Gourds', de Moor (1987: 272: Ug. *kṯ*; 1973: 95 n. 3). 'Rest', L'Heureux (1979: 153, 157, citing Akk. *kâšu*, Syr. *kāš*).

44. Ug. *dpr*. Meaning unknown. 'Smell': L'Heureux (1979: 153, 157) and del Olmo (1981a: 423, 538) taking up Virolleaud's suggestion (1941a: 25: Ar. *dfr*, *ḏfr*), but the term means 'stink' rather than 'perfume': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 475 n. e) and Lewis (1996a: 139-40)! 'Hall', de Moor (1987: 272).

45. Ug. *q'l*. If wine (and especially new wine) is to be drunk, it can scarcely be 'flowers of the vine' (thus del Olmo 1981a: 619).

46. Ug. *mlkm*. Lewis (1996a: 131): 'fit for kings'. The term may have a technical rather than merely aesthetic sense. Cf. *bnš mlk*, 'royal personnel' (Heltzer 1982: 3-15).

47. Or 'all that day'? Cf. L'Heureux (1979: 153, 157): 'all day'; Lewis (1996a: 131): 'daylong'.

48. Following Aistleitner's suggestion (*WUS*, 337 §2884), followed by Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 476 n. g); cf. del Olmo (1981a: 424, 642) and de Moor (1987: 272) for the view that this is a toponym, a place renowned for its wine, though hardly Lake Hule. Cf. Aartun (1985: 42 §125). Was it a place in the Lebanon? Cf. l. 20 below. L'Heureux (1979: 153) divides: *ṯm*, 'there' and *k*, 'like'.

49. Ug. *mrṯ.yn*: lit. 'must of wine'. Cf. Aartun (1984: 35, 50: §§45, 64).

50. Ug. *srnm*. Cf. Heb. *seren* (Gk. *turannos*), used of the Philistine rulers. Or is this too a Lebanese toponym?

wine to delight the thirsty[51],
the wine of ecstasy[52],

1.22 i 20 (from) high up[53] in the Lebanon,
dew! transformed into foaming wine by El.

Lo,
a day and a second,
the saviours ate and drank,

a third, a fourth day,
a fifth, a sixth day,
the saviours ate and drank,

in the lofty banqueting-house,
1.22 i 25 on the peak[54], in the heart of the Lebanon.

See,
on the seventh [ ]
[ ] Valiant Baal,
...

1.22 i (indeterminate number of lines missing)

(if verso, as assumed above, no
following columns on this tablet)

51. Ug. *bld ǵll*. Thus Caquot (1974: 476 nn. j and k) and L'Heureux (1979: 153, 157-58). Cf. de Moor (1987: 272): 'wine with no after-thirst'. Based on Ar. *laḏ ḏa*, 'be sweet', and Ar. *ǵalîl*, 'thirsty'. Cf. Lewis (1992: 131, 140): 'wine, sweet and abundant'; he candidly admits of this and the following colon that 'everyone admits to guessing here'! But note Renfroe's strictures (1992: 107, 125). Aistleitner (*WUS*, 49 §519), Gibson (1978: 143) and del Olmo (1981a: 424, 527): 'land' (Ar. *baladu*). On this see Renfroe (1992: 90). *DLU* (p. 156), 'mythical region of wine-production'. There is no reason why this should not be a *real* region.

52. Ug. *išryt*. Cf. Heb. *'ešer*. Thus del Olmo (1981a: 424, 523): 'felicity' and de Moor (1987: 272): 'happiness'. Caquot (1974: 476 n. l): 'the first pressing': *šry*, 'begin'. Aartun (1985: 35-36 §115): 'first quality'. Cf. *DLU*. Virolleaud (1934c: 150: '[wine of] the Assyrian women') and Aistleitner (1964: 86; *WUS*, 39 §447) take it as a toponym (cf. *šryn*?).

53. Ug. *'nq.smd*. Cf. Aartun (1985: 5, 11-12 §§74, 80). Aistleitner (1964: 86; *WUS*, 220, 237 §§1922, 2062): 'highest pride'. Caquot (1974: 476 and nn. m and n): 'the choicest product of the plants' (metaphorical use of *'nq*, cf. Heb. *'ᵃnāq*, 'neck', and Akk. *asmidu*, plant-name). 'Necklace of the blooming vines': del Olmo (1981a: 424). 'Purple necklace': de Moor (1987: 272).

54. Lit. 'narrow place, strait'. (√*ṣwq*, Heb. *ṣwq*, Ar. *ḍāqa*). 'Poured' (√*yṣq*): del Olmo (1981a: 424). 'Crest': de Moor (1987: 273).

KTU 1.23: The Gracious Gods: A Sacred Marriage Liturgy

(KTU 1.23 = CTA 23 = UT 52 = SS = RS 2.002)

Select Bibliography

Virolleaud 1933; Ginsberg 1935; Gaster 1946, 1950: 225-56, 1961: 418-35; Largement 1949; Jirku 1962: 80-84; Aistleitner 1964: 58-62; de Moor 1972: II, 17-24, 1987: 117-28; Trujillo 1973; Tsumura 1973, 1978; Xella 1973; Caquot and Sznycer 1974: 353-79; Tsevat 1974a; Gordon 1977: 59-64; Wyatt 1977a, 1987a, 1992b, 1996b: 224-29; Pope 1979; del Olmo 1981a: 440-48; Cutler and Macdonald 1982; Lipiński 1986; Segert 1986; Foley 1987; Hettema 1989–90; Schloen 1993; Aboud 1994: 189-92; Watson 1994b; Pardee 1997c: 274-83; T.J. Lewis in Parker 1997: 205-14; Dijkstra 1998; Gulde 1998.

Characterized by some as a 'fertility cult' myth, by Cutler and Macdonald (1982) as a famine-relief liturgy, by Pardee (1997c) as a possible analogue or component of an autumnal vintage and new year festival (cf. KTU 1.41), and possibly (Wyatt 1996b) even having a connection with a royal marriage, this text narrates a 'sacred marriage' between El and his two wives (see further below), Athirat and Rahmay, who appear to be hypostases of Shapsh the sun-goddess. While falling broadly speaking into the category of 'narrative poetry' (Hettema 1989–90), the text is unusual in Ugarit in combining myth with ritual instructions and liturgical elements, which are interleaved with the introduction to the main narrative in ll. 1-29 (the whole of the recto), horizontal lines separating the different sub-sections. The myth itself (ll. 30-76) underlies the tradition behind a number of biblical texts (Porter 1978; Wyatt 1996b, 219-68), and Pardee's (1997c: 274) assessment that it deals with 'a pair of relatively minor deities' is probably a fair reflection of current opinion on the text, but in my view underestimates their considerable ideological importance as 'royal gods',[1] who reflect in their mythology certain important constants. This

1. Pardee's further note on the status of the female characters in the text as 'two women' (*aṯt*, alt. 'two wives') threatens to prejudge the matter of the significance of the twin gods born of the marriage, though he concedes their divine status. If the more neutral translation 'wives' is adopted, the similar status of the wives as goddesses, which I believe to be the case, at least remains an open question. The position of Shalem as the last god mentioned in the pantheon lists (KTU 1.47.34 = KTU 1.118.33 = RS 20.24.33) and sacrificial lists such as KTU 1.39.8 and 1.41.17

divergence of views is inevitable of course given the overall paucity of the evidence, but it is perhaps as well to reserve judgment on comprehensive assessments. There is a clear disparity between the relative importance of a mere handful of deities in the (so far recovered) mythology of Ugarit and that of a large number of others appearing, frequently with a surprising prominence, in the ritual texts. Each genre gives only a partial oversight of the reality, while the Akk. evidence further complicates matters. The text is defined by de Moor (1987: 117) as a sacred marriage text. This is reasonable in so far as it actually deals with a marriage, but we need to be clear what 'sacred marriage' (*hieros gamos*) means, and the use of the term sometimes implies that the same kind of significance is to be applied in all cases, as though it is just a tantric use of sex in the cult. It is here that I think the *royal* dimension is important. A mythic paradigm is established here which is used to convey basic notions about the concern of the chief deity for the created order, and the implicit identification of his offspring with kings becomes the means whereby royal duties are represented as actualizing the theological programme. This is parallel to many features of the historical cult in Judah (though the biblical texts muddy the waters, of course, by their removal from the original historical context and their persistent critique of tradition).

1.23 R 1 Let me invoke the gra[cious] gods,
[ ] and beautiful,
sons of Shap[sh?[2]]
Let them give a feast [to those] of high rank[3],

(= 1.87.18) need not simply be a reflection of rank, for he is a god who as the evening star, or dusk (opinion varies on this matter) would logically or symbolically conclude such lists: the last in line is not always the lowest in rank. At Edinburgh the Principal walks last in the graduation processions! Pardee concedes this point.

2. Text *bn.šp*[ ]: *bn.šp*[*š*] following ll. 25, 54. Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 369) and del Olmo (1981a: 440): 'dunes' (cf. *špm*, l. 4) (sc. the 'bare hills' of de Moor 1987: 118). Virolleaud (1933: 129, 132) reads *bn.š* [*rm*(?)], 'sons of a prince(?)'. For my interpretation cf. translation at l. 54.

3. Ug. *ytnm.qrt.l'ly*[ ]. The colon is open to reading in three senses: either as here, or 'who establish a city on high': thus Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 369), Gibson (1978: 123), de Moor (1987:118) and Pardee (1997c: 276); or 'may glory be given to the exalted ones': thus Xella (1973: 41-42), del Olmo (1981a: 440) and Hettema (1989–90: 82). √*qrt*: 'feast, banquet' (Akk. *qarītu*, *qirītu*): Trujillo (1973),

in the wilderness of the end[4] (of the world).

1.23 R 5 [ ] on their heads,
[ ]

Eat from any[5] of the food,
and drink from the vat[6] any wine!

Greetings, king, greetings, queen, priests[7] and temple-victuallers[8]![9]

The lord and master[10] sat enthroned,
in his hand the staff[11] of sterility,

cit. del Olmo (1981a: 440, 658); 'city', cf. Heb. *qiryat*: *WUS*, 283 §2462, *UT*, §481 19.2284 etc.; 'glory, honour', [*qrt* < *yqr*]: Ginsberg (1935: 47). The sequel (bicolon in l. 6) makes Trujillo's proposal the best. Are 'those of high rank' (*'ly*[*nm*]: restoration proposed by Gaster 1946: 51) men or gods, or both? (Cf. Heb. *'elyôn*, used of the king in Ps. 89.28.)

4. Ug. *špm*. I explain as cognate with Heb. *sôp*, 'end'. Cf. KTU 1.1 ii 11. The desert is at the edge of the world. Or 'dunes' (cf. n. 2). 'Barren hill-tops': Pardee (1997c: 276 and n. 8). De Moor (1987: 118) restores [*tdm*]*r* in l. 4, and locates the events at Tadmor-Palmyra.

5. Ug. *ay*: 'any' (Ar. *ayyu*): *UT*, 355 §19.142, Xella (1973: 45-46) and del Olmo (1981a: 512). Cf. Pardee (1997c: 276): 'Eat the food, yes do'.

6. Ug. *ḫmr*: 'vat' rather than 'new wine'. Cf. KTU 1.3 i 16 and n. 9.

7. Ug. *'rbm*. Cf. Akk. *erêb bîti*, a class of priest.

8. Ug. *ṯnnm*. For Cutler and Macdonald (1982: 39), these people supplied the meat for the temple (Akk. *šanannu*: cf. *CAD*, XVII [Š/2], 366 'archer[?]'). Others see them as military personnel ('temple guards': cf. Xella 1973: 151-56; cf. Eg. *snn* and KTU 1.14 ii 38 etc.: *ṯnn dbl hg*: 'archers beyond reckoning'). But a military sense is not entirely convincing here (unless they form a praetorian guard?), and I suspect two lexemes.

9. The lines drawn across the tablet at intervals appear to mark out separate stages in the ritual and distinct rubrics.

10. Ug. *mt wšr*: most take this to be Mot (e.g. Tsumura 1973). I take it to be El: see Wyatt (1977a, 1992b). Cf. *mt* below, ll. 40, 46, 'husband' (lit. 'man'). Cf. Pardee (1997c: 276-77 n. 13): he explains the name as 'warrior prince', seeing the staff as a weapon 'because warriors slay sons and husbands in battle'.

11. This staff (presumably the same one in both cola) will later (l. 37) function as El's penis. It is the 'staff' (phytological metaphor) which is about to be attended to in the following ritual action, which will transform it into a productive organ. See also nn. 36-38 below, and the use of the staff in KTU 1.169. See discussion by Pardee (1997c: 276-77 n. 13). This raises two problems. First the appropriateness of the themes of sterility and widowhood to the present interpretation, and secondly my identification of *mt wšr* with El himself (n. 10). In the first case the point is that

in his hand the staff of widowhood.

Those who prune the vine pruned him,
those who bind the vine bound him;
1.23 R 10 they let his tendril[12] fall like a vine.

Seven times shall it be recited on the throne-dais[13],
and the priests are to respond.

Now the steppe[14], the vast[15] steppe
is the steppe of Athirat and Rahma<y>[16].

Over a fire seven times the choristers of fine voice
(seethe) coriander[17] in milk,

until the marriage is consummated according to the proper ritual programme (starting with premarital circumcision, n. 12) it cannot be productive; the seated figure (the bridegroom) holds emblems which have a *double-entendre*: at present they represent his single state, which for purposes of fecundity is sterile. A husband who cannot service his wife effectively makes her a widow. After the due rites, the staff (which represents his penis) will become fertile and productive. Moreover, since the twin gods Shahar and Shalem, whom I identify with the gracious gods, are not born, indeed not even conceived yet (because the fecundating rite which will make this possible is only now being performed) they cannot be identified with *mt wšr*. It is their father who is so represented. Note the discussion on rhabdomancy in Moore 1990: 71-78.

12. On the meaning of *šdmt* see Wyatt (1992c) and Pardee (1997c: 277-78 n. 17). The ritual performed is one of pre-marital circumcision (Wyatt 1992b). Thus the 'tendril' is a metaphor for the foreskin. Cf. Wyatt (1990a), where I discuss the story of Shechem's circumcision and ritual killing, which belong to the same symbolic context as the present narrative. Cf. Allan 1999.

13. Ug. *'d*: || *ksi* in KTU 1. 16 vi 22. See also KTU 1.119.9. See Largement (1949: 55) and del Olmo (1981a: 598). Rather than 'lute' (Ar. *'ûdu*: Driver 1956: 121, Caquot 1974: 370).

14. Ug. *šd* (Akk. *šadu*, Heb. *śādê*, 'steppe'). Thus, e.g., Gaster (1946: 52), Gibson (1978: 123) and del Olmo (1981a: 447): 'field(s)'. Rather than 'breast' (Ug. *ṯd*, *zd* [l. 24], *ḏd* [ll. 59, 61], Heb. *šad*, *šōd*): thus for the third instance Ginsberg (1935: 65) and Driver (1956: 121): 'effluence' (sc. milk [from the breast]), and see Tsevat (1953: 62) (cit. *'śd'*).

15. Ug. *ilm*: superlative sense.

16. Restored on basis of ll. 16 and 28 (the same formula). Ug. *rḥmy*, 'uterine', 'wombly', divine epithet. It does *not* refer to Anat, but to a companion of Athirat. The two are hypostases of Shapsh. See further Pardee (1997c: 278 n. 22).

17. Ug. *gd*. If correct reading, 'coriander' (cf. Heb. *gad*). Virolleaud (1933: 140), reads as equivalent of *gdy* (Heb. *gᵉdî*), 'kid'. So also Ginsberg (1935: 65, with reference to Exod. 23.19 and parallels). Cf. Loewenstamm (1975b: 106) on the

mint in butter,

1.23 R 15 and over the cauldron seven times
let incense be burned.

Rahmay went forth,
[and Athirat] set out[18].

[ ] they girded themselves.

May the gracious[19] chorister [ ]
and their name let the priest e[xalt.]

The dwellings[20] of the gods eight [ ]
1.23 R 20 seven times [ ][21]

Lapis lazuli, carnelian[22]
scarlet the singers[23]...[24]

interpretation of this passage. See also Ratner and Zuckerman (1986) for recent assessment of the reading and now Pardee (1997c: 278-79 n. 26).

18. Ug. *tṣd*. Perhaps 'set out to hunt'. Cf. KTU 1.92.2 (with Athtart) and 1.114.23 (with Anat and Athtart) as subjects.

19. Ug. *n'm*. The Heb. term *nā'îm* appears to mean 'minstrel' in 2 Sam. 23.1. Perhaps a similar nuance is to be detected here.

20. Ug. *mṯbt*. Pardee (1997c: 279 and n. 32) draws attention to cut-branch structures used in the cult in KTU 1.41.50-51, also called *mṯbt*. It may be the same structures again which are called *bt* ('hous[es]') in KTU 1.104.21, where as here they are said to be eight in number. He compares the Heb. *sukkôt*. The idea of shrines to the gods drawn up in rows also suggests a possible analogue of the Eg. Sed rites, which involved parallel ranks of the shrines of the deities of Upper and Lower Egypt, as in the mock-up in the enclosure of Djoser's step-pyramid at Saqqara.

21. A ritual involving the divine images. Are the 'dwellings' (*mṯbt*) the images? Hettema (1989–90: 83): 'stands'.

22. Ug. *iqnu.šmt*: Akk. *aqnu*, *uqnu*, and Akk. *šimtu*. Thus Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 372), Gibson (1978: 124) and de Moor (1987: 122). Cf. del Olmo (1981a: 442): 'Of blue and scarlet (wool) [ ]'; Hettema (1989–90: 83): 'blue and gold-coloured [ ]'. Preferable to alternative: 'I am jealous for the names [ ]' (√*qn'*): thus Virolleaud (1933: 133), Ginsberg (1935: 65), Gaster (1946: 52; 1961: 426), Driver (1956: 121) and Xella (1973: 36, 58). *iqnu* corrected to *iqra* by Aistleitner (1964: 59).

23. Ug. *ṯn.šrm*. [ ]. To *ṯn* cf. Heb. *šānî* (*UT*, 503 §19.2702); or 'the two'. *šrm*: 'singers' (√*šyr*) or 'princes' (cf. Akk. *šarru*). Virolleaud (1933: 130), reads [*b*]*n šrm*: 'sons of a prince' (cf. at l. 2 above).

Let me invoke the gracious gods,
[both gluttonous[25] from] birth[26],
who suck at the nipples of Athirat's breasts,
[from the paps of Rahmay,]

1.23 R 25 Shapsh counts[27] their tendrils,
[ ] and grapes.

Peace to you, priests and temple-victuallers,
as you proceed to the sacrifice of propitiation.

The vast steppe
is the steppe of Athirat and Rahmay,
[ ]...[28]

24. Though both cola are conventionally shown as having a following lacuna, there is probably no text missing.

25. Ug. *agzrym*: 'voracious, gluttonous', Xella (1973: 58-59), del Olmo (1981a: 510) and de Moor (1987: 122), construed as du. All cite √*gzr* in Isa. 9.19 (parallel *'kl*, with sense of devouring, though √*gzr* means 'cut, divide'). Virolleaud (1933: 142), reads as 'cleave the sea', citing Ps. 136.13 (√*gzr*, Heb. *gāzar*, as cited). Cf. *agzrt* at KTU 1.13 ii 29-30. Pardee (1997c: 279 and n. 35), taking up Gray's (1965: 98) suggestion, plausibly translates as 'who delimit the day'.

26. Line restored from ll. 58-59. Ug. [*bn*] *ym*: 'from birth', lit. 'sons of a day'. This expression may alternatively mean 'sons of (the same) day', thus alluding to their twinship.

27. Text uncertain. See Herdner (1963: I, 99 n. 4), Xella (1973: 60) and del Olmo (1981a: 442). Del Olmo translates 'Šapšu who takes care of their weakness', taken up by Hettema (1989–90: 83) and Pardee (1997c: 279 and n. 37). I read provisionally *msprt* (√*spr*). Otherwise *mṣprt*: *KTU*^{2}: 'Shapsh cuts...': Watson (1994b: 4 n. 13, Akk. *ṣepēru*); 'Shapsh who nurses...': Hettema (1989–90: 83), √*ṣpr, Ar. *ḍāfara*); or *myprt* ('Shapsh makes fruitful...'): Ginsberg (1935: 66) and Gaster (1946: 52, 57; 1961: 426), √*ypr*: *UT*, 413 §19.1136, cf. Ar., Eth., ESA *wfr*, Heb. *pārâ*. Cf. Virolleaud (1933: 130), and translation (p. 133)! However translated, the text probably narrates some action by the goddess which is represented dramatically in the cultic performance. The 'tendrils' approach is circumstantially supported by the parallel 'grapes'. Is this an allusion to genitalia? Is Shapsh perhaps checking that they are male children?

28. Text *ytb*. Being contextless, it is untranslatable. Hettema's suggestion, 'That it be repeated' (1989–90: 83), is attractive as an introduction to the ensuing narrative.

lower edge 30 [El went out] to the shore[29] of the sea,
and stepped out to the shore of the abyss[30].

El [set] the two inflamed ones[31],
the two inflamed ones on top of the cauldron[32].

Lo, one was lowered,
lo, the other was raised.

Lo, one cried: 'Father! father!'
and lo, the other cried: 'Mother! mother![33]

Let El's penis grow as long as the sea,
yea, El's penis as the ocean[34]!'

1.23 V 35 El's penis grew as long as the sea,
yea, El's penis as the ocean.

El took the two inflamed ones,

the two inflamed ones from on top of the cauldron;

29. For *gp ym* read rather *ḫ'p ym*. Cf. Whitaker (1972: 278). Cf. KTU 1.3 ii 7.

30. The use of *thm* locates the mythical events: this is the end of the world. Cf. Hettema (1989–90: 86).

31. Ug. *mšt'ltm*: (Št [= Hithp.] √*'ly*, cf. Heb. *'ālâ* Hiph., 'rouse') du. pt. Cf. Tropper (1990: 77-78): 'who offer themselves for sex'. 'Two coals': Ginsberg (1935: 66); 'two handfuls': Gaster (1946: 53) and Driver (1956: 123); 'two women bringing up (water)': Caquot (1974: 373); 'two women who moved up and down' (Št freq.): Gibson (1978: 125); 'two consecrated ones(?)': del Olmo (1981a: 443); 'scales': de Moor (1972: II, 20); 'girl-acrobats': de Moor (1987: 123); 'two female sacrificers': Hettema (1989–90: 83); cf. Pardee (1997c: 280 and n. 44). These cultic nuances are a plausible alternative to the line taken here. Untranslated: Virolleaud and Xella.

32. Pursuing his cultic interpretation (as in the previous colon), Pardee (1997c: 280) translates: '(two females) presenting (him with) an offering from the jar'. While this is attractive, the basis for it, that the sexual nuances detected by Tropper are not yet present, is belied by the fact that *double entendres*, if not overtly erotic language, begin immediately.

33. Like other primaeval gods, El is androgynous: he marries his own daughter(s). Cf. Jerusalem and Wisdom as daughters of Yahweh. Discussion in Wyatt (1996b: 255 n. 81, 265-68). Pardee (1997c: 280 n. 47) remains dubious that this is an address to El.

34. Ug. *mdb*. For my translation (rather than 'flood') cf. de Moor (1969a: 181) and KTU 1.101.2. The simile of a penis 'as *long* as the sea/ocean' reads oddly in English, but if it is remembered that the cosmic sea is serpentine by nature, the force is immediately apparent. Cf. Neiman's (1977) etymology of Gk. Ὠκεανος from √*gḥn*, 'a serpent's belly'. Cf. Gihon in Gen. 2.13 and Wyatt (1996b: 96-99).

he took them and se[t] them in his house.

El lowered[35] the staff[36] in his right hand,
El the rod[37] in his hand[38].

He raised it and threw it skyward[39],
casting a bird down from the sky.

He plucked it and set it on the coals.

El enticed the two wives;
lo, the two wives cried out:

1.23 V 40 'O husband, husband! Lowered is your staff,
drooping the rod in your hand![40]'

Lo, the bird grew hot[41] by the fire;
it was roasted on the coals.

The two wives are the wives of El,
the wives of El, and forever.[42]

And lo, the two wives cried out:

'O father, father! Lowered is your staff,
drooping the rod in your hand!'

Lo, the bird grew hot by the fire;
1.23 V 45 and was roasted on the coals.

35. Ug. *nḥt*. Thus e.g. del Olmo (1981a: 444). Pardee (1997c: 280) 'grasps'.

36. Ug. *ḫṭ*: this is the staff El held in ll. 8-9: now it is a symbol of, in effect transformed into, his penis. Cf. n. 11 and l. 40. 'When El had aimed his staff': Hettema (1989–90: 83).

37. The same staff. The term *mṭ* (Heb. *maṭṭê*) serves in both arboreal and social contexts. Note that *mṭ ydh* corresponds to *mṭ ydk* in ll. 40, 44 and 47.

38. The left hand (as distinct from the right). But *yd* also means 'penis', so a deliberate wordplay is no doubt intended. See also at ll. 37 (*-h*), 44, 47. (The left hand being the toilet hand, delicacy is preserved.) It is difficult to know whether to translate 'the rod *in* your (his) hand' or 'the rod *of* your (his) penis'. I have been guided by the colon of l. 37 (*ymn* parallel *yd*).

39. A play on associated ideas. The staff is now an arrow, now a penis. The bird (to be killed and roasted) will symbolise the passion of El's wives. See discussion in Pardee (1997c: 280-81 n. 51).

40. Ug. *mṭ ydk*, and at ll. 44, 47. Either 'the rod (in) your hand', or 'the rod of your penis'. See n. 38. No doubt the *double-entendre* is intended.

41. Cf. n. 39. As de Moor notes (e.g. 1987: 124), ornithological language is often used for women (especially in sexual contexts).

42. As the bird cooks, the marriage 'cooks', i.e., is consummated.

The two daughters are the daughters of El,
the daughters of El, and forever.[43]

And lo, the two wives cried out:
'O husband, husband! Lowered is your staff,
drooping the rod in your hand!'

Lo, the bird grew hot by the fire,
and was roasted on the coals.

The two wives are the wive[s of El],
the wives of El, and forever.

He stooped: their lips he kissed.

1.23 V 50 O, how sweet were their lips,
as sweet as pomegranate[s];

from kissing came conception,
from embracing, impregnation.[44]

<He sat and counted
five (months) for growth,
ten for the full completion.>[45]

<Both of them> crouched[46]
and gave birth to Shahar and Shalem[47].

Word was brought to El:

'The two wives of El have given birth!'

'What have they borne?'
'Shahar and Shalem have been born'.

43. Pardee (1997c: 281) interprets this as a set of conditions, in which the women become wives or daughters. But they are already both.

44. The delicacy of the imagery is surprising. Cf. the description from Deir el Bahri of the divine conception of Hatshepsut (pure Barbara Cartland!): Breasted (1906 [1988 reprint]: II, 80 §196).

45. Watson (1994b: 7), following Tsumura (1978: 388), proposes adding the tricolon from ll. 56-57 here, arguing it to be an unintentional omission. See further below. Ll. 49-52 and 55-58 contain identical wording except for the tricolon.

46. The vb *tqt*[*nṣn*] is du. In ll. 57-58 the expression is *klat tqtnṣn*, 'both of them crouched': is the *klat* to be restored here? I have done so on prosodic grounds: *klat tqtnṣn* || *wtldn* is a bicolon, the *klat* doing double duty.

47. Hypostases of Venus (Athtar), respectively the morning and evening stars.

'Raise up an offering[48] to Shapsh, the Great Lady[49],
and to the stars[50] who have been begotten[51]'.

1.23 V 55 He stooped; their lips he kissed.
Lo, their lips were swee[t],
[sweet as pomegranates].

From kissing came conception,
from embracing, impregnation.

He sat and counted
five (months) for growth,
ten for the full completion[52].

Both of them crouched
and gave birth.

48. Sc. a ritual of purification and thanksgiving following childbirth.

49. Ug. *rbt* (Akk. *rabitu*), the equivalent of Heb. *gᵉbîrâ*. Otherwise used only of Athirat, who here, with Rahmay, appears to be a hypostasis of Shapsh. The Akk. term *rabitu* is used of the queen mother of Amurru (RS 16.270.5 etc.). 'A large city': de Moor (1972: II, 22); 'great works': de Moor (1987: 126).

50. On *kbkbm* as a designation for gods, cf. KTU 1.10 i 4, where it appears, apparently, in parallel with *bn il*. See also Bordreuil (1995: 2) and Caquot (1995: 5). Perhaps the epithet of Pughat, *yd't hlk kbkbm*, appearing in KTU 1.19 ii 2-3 etc. (see n. 209 *ad loc.*), is as much a theological as an astronomical term.

51. Ug. *kbkbm.kn*[*m*]. On √*kn* (Heb. *kwn*) 'to beget' see Wyatt (1996b: 227 n. 29, 242; Ps. 8.4b, || *ma'asê 'uṣbᵉ'ōtêkā*, also with a sexual nuance). 'Fixed stars': Gibson (1978: 126), del Olmo (1981a: 445) and Hettema (1989–90: 84). If Shahar and Shalem are the deities of the planet Venus, they are scarcely 'fixed' stars. Other fixed stars (even as deities) do not seem germane to the present context. 'A stable one (sc. city)': de Moor (1972: II, 22). 'Lasting works for the stars': de Moor (1987: 126).

52. Following the interpretation of Tsumura (1978) (text: *yṯbn.yspr.lḫmš.lṣb* [*i.l'*]*šr.pḫr.klat*), Hettema (1989–90: 85) and Watson (1994b: 8). The period of pregnancy is described (ten lunar months). Cf. KTU 1.17 ii 43-44. These lines have conventionally been read quite differently, e.g. del Olmo (1981a: 446) (text: *yṯbn.yspr.lḫmš.lṣ*lmm[.]w*yšr.pḫr.klat*, as *KTU*[2]) as

> This is to be recited five times to the sound of cymbals,
> and the assembly shall sing.

The verbs *yṯbn* and *yspr* are m. sg. (as Tsumura, referring to the father) or 3rd. f. du. (referring to the mothers), but not impersonal (as Hettema). Cf. Virolleaud (1933: xix): *yṯbn. yspr.lḫmš.lṣb*(?)[ ]*šr.pḫr.klat*; Xella (1973: 35): *yṯb*[*n*]. *yspr.lḫmš.lṣ*[----------]*šr.pḫr.klat*; *KTU*[2]: *yṯb*n. *yspr.lḫmš.l*ṣmm[.]w *yšr.pḫr klat*.

They bore the gracious gods[53],
both gluttonous from birth,
sucking at the nipples (of the Lady's) breasts.

Word was brought to El:

1.23 V 60 'The two wives of El have given birth!'
'What have they borne?'

'The two gracious gods!
both gluttonous from birth,
sucking at the nipples of the Lady's breasts.

A lip to the underworld,
a lip to the heavens[54],

and there entered into their mouths
the birds of the air
and the fish from the sea.

And wandering abroad, piece by piece
they put (things) from both their right
and from their left into their mouths,
and were not satisfied.'

'O wives whom I have married,
1.23 V 65 O sons whom I have begotten,

raise up a dais in the midst of the holy desert[55]:
there you will make your dwelling[56] among the stones

53. The 'gracious gods' are Shahar and Shalem.

54. Cf. the description of Mot in KTU 1.5 ii 2-3. Their voracious appetites, described in the following lines, are to be compared both to Mot's and to those of the Devourers in KTU 1.12.

55. De Moor (1987: 127): 'Arise! Establish a sanctuary in the desert'. Wilfred Watson suggests (private communication) shifting the word-divider after *'db* to read thus: *šu.'d<.>btk.mdbr.qdš*: 'raise up a dais (or: throne) in the midst of the desert'. This makes better sense of the line, and fits in well with the following colon. Note the paradox of a sanctuary at the limen (cf. the burning bush motif in Exod. 3).

56. Ug. *tgrgr*. Redupl. (D? cf. Heb. pilpel) form of √*gwr*, 'dwell': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 378), *UT*, 381 §19.618, *DLU*, 150). Or are the stones and trees also part of the diet of the voracious gods (cf. ll. 61-64), so that *tgrgr* means 'you will open your gullets' or 'swallow'? Cf. Heb. *garg^{e}rôt*, 'neck' and Fr. 'gorge', Eng. 'gargle'. Cf. *DLU*, 151: *grgr*. The vb would be denom. on this n. stem. Less probably, 'drag along' (sc. as building materials for the sanctuary): de Moor (1987: 127

and trees'.

For seven whole years,
for eight periods of time[57],
the gracious gods went to and fro on the steppe;
they roamed the edge of the desert.

And they met the guardian of the sown land.
And they cried out to the guardian of the sown land:

1.23 V 70 'O guardian, guardian! Open up!'

And he made an opening for them,
and they entered.

'If there is food for us,
give (some) that we may eat.

If there is wine for us,
give (some) that we may drink.'

And the guardian of the sown land answered them:

'[ ]
There *is* wine: whoever enters [ ]

1.23 V 75 [ ] let him come!
Here is his measure of wine [ ]
And his companions let him fill with wine [ ].'

n. 63), citing Syr. *gargar*, Syr. Ar. *ǧarǧar* (cf. also Heb. *gārar*).

57. Cf. the similar formula in KTU 1.12 ii 44-45 (n. 29). It no doubt denotes a ritual period. Cf. seven-year periods in Hebrew thought.

KTU 1.24: The Wedding of Nikkal and Ib

(KTU 1.24 = CTA 24 = UT 77 = NK = RS 5.194)

Select Bibliography

Virolleaud 1936b; Gordon 1937, 1977: 65-67; Aistleitner 1939, 1964: 63-64; Ginsberg 1939; Goetze 1941; Herdner 1949; Tsevat 1953; Driver 1956: 125-27; Jirku 1962: 77-79; Herrmann 1968; Caquot and Sznycer 1974: 381-97; Wyatt 1977a; Gibson 1978: 128-29; del Olmo 1981a: 449-56, 1991; de Moor 1987: 141-45; D. Marcus in Parker 1997: 215-18; Allan 1999.

While the deities in this text are familiar, their relationships appear to differ from those we meet elsewhere at Ugarit. They probably reflect Hurrian tradition, and perhaps the Hurrian pantheon (Ginsberg 1939). The moon-god referred to as Yarih (*yrḫ*) is probably therefore the Hurrian deity Kusuḫ. Nikkal is the Sumerian goddess NIN.GAL ('Great Lady'). The text consists of a myth of the wedding of Nikkal-and-Ib, and is followed by a hymn to the Kotharat, goddesses of pregnancy and childbirth. The myth and hymn were probably recited at weddings.[1]

1.24 R 1 Let me sing of Nikkal-and-Ib[2],
the daughter of Harhab[3] king of circumcision,
of Harhab king of weddings[4].

At the setting of the sun Yarih became inflamed;
1.24 R 5 he em[braced her] who was born of the <Ko>tharat[5].

1. Cf. the 'mythological' allusion to the marriage at Cana in Christian wedding services.

2. In Wyatt (1977a), I argued that these were the names of two deities, the bride and groom respectively. This proposal has not met with approval. The f. form *t'rbm* in l. 18 is the strongest argument against it. I therefore follow the usual view in this edition. 'Ib': Akk. *enbu*, 'fruit' and Akk. *ebbu*, 'bright' are equally plausible explanations. *DLU*, 2 (*ib* II).

3. Perhaps formed from *ḫrr* and *ḫrb*: 'Drier'. Is this an epithet of the Hurrian sun-god Shimegi?

4. De Moor (1987: 142 nn. 6, 7) interprets the titles of Harhab (*mlk qṣ*, *mlk aǵzt*) as 'counsellor for exchange-marriages' and 'counsellor for protection-marriages' respectively. Ug. *aǵzt*, 'wedding': Akk. *aḫuzzatu*. *qṣ* = 'circumcision': Allan 1999.

5. Note the mythological motif: Nikkal is daughter of the Kotharat. In caring for her parturition, they may be invoked for all births. The plot is apparently a pre-marital affair, perhaps the birth of a son (see translation at l. 7 and n. 9) followed by

He[ar, goddesses, Ko]tharat,
O daughters of Ellil[6], [the Bright Ones[7]]![8]

Lo,
the sacred bride[9] bore[10] a son [ ]
Her vulva yearned for his penis [ ],
her lips for his organ[11] were moist.

the lover's urgency to marry his beloved. Cf. Gen. 34 (on the Hurrian[!] and ritual background of which see Wyatt 1990a). On cognate myths see Astour (1967: 80-92). The main difference is that here there is also a birth (l. 7, if the verbal aspect represents a past tense). The outcome here is also a happy marriage, while in the biblical narrative it ends in tragedy. The element of premarital circumcision, found in Gen. 34, is absent from the present text, but appears in KTU 1.23.8-11 (see n. 12 *ad loc.*).

6. For the view that this is Enlil (also occurring as Ellil, identified in Ugarit with El), see Gallagher (1994). For an alternative view, that it represents the deity Helul, see Pardee (1995: cols. 916-17), following Arnaud (1986: 328; 1991: 38). The term *hll* has usually been explained here as the new moon (Ar. *hilāl*). Pardee's and Gallagher's explanations would explain the apparent disjunction between the crescent moon in l. 15 and the moon-god Yarih in l. 16. The reference to 'the lord of Gamlu' in l. 42 would appear to support Gallagher against Pardee. (I am sceptical of Gallagher's extension of his argument to Isa. 14.) A lunar link is also plausible for goddesses of pregnancy and childbirth.

7. Ug. *snnt*. Pardee (1995: col. 917), following van Selms (1954: 86 n. 24). Rather than 'swallows' (Akk. *sinuntu*, Heb. *sᶜnūnîṯ*), as others (already Virolleaud 1936: 213).

8. The allusion to the Kotharat, apparently as the collective mothers of Nikkal, causes the poet to invoke them directly at this point in this exclamatory manner, as well as at ll. 11, 15, perhaps in anticipation of the hymn addressing them directly in ll. 40-50. It suggests that the narrative itself is here given a hymnic context in the context of a wedding ceremony.

9. Ug. *ǵlmt*: to the line cf. Isa. 7.14. Rather than 'young woman'. The term is restricted to royal women and goddesses. See at KTU 1.2 i 13 and n. 99.

10. Ug. *tld*. Or 'begot'? Or 'will bear'. Thus Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 392) and del Olmo (1981a: 457) etc. Or 'would beget'? Cf. the formula at Isa. 7.14.

11. Ug. *bšr*. We appear to have at least six words serving the same function: *yd*, 'penis', *uṣbᶜt*, 'phallus' (both in KTU 1.10 iii 7-8, partially restored, and n. 17 *ad loc.*, and cf. KTU 1.4 iv 38 and n. 130: note further the parallel word *ahbt* in l. 39), *ḫṭ*, perhaps by word-play and association rather than strict semantics, in KTU 1.23.8-9, 37 (also note nuance of || *mṭ ydh*) which some have also seen as the basic reference in KTU 1.169 (see n. 2 *ad loc.*), *ušr* in KTU 1.11.3, and here also *bšr* (lit. 'flesh'). De Moor (1987: 143 n. 16) notes that Heb. *bāsār* is used of the penis in Lev. 6.3; 15.2-3; Ezek. 16.26; 23.20. If Margalit's (1989a: 324, 328) proposal be accepted, we have a seventh term in *ṯir* at KTU 1.18 i 25.

1.24 R 10 Her father gave her life,[12]
as a betrothed one [ ]

'Hear, goddesses, Kotharat
<O daughters of Ellil, the Bright Ones!>'

Her <vu>lva[13] yearned for his penis.

To her father [ ]
Dagan of Tuttu[l[14]]

1.24 R 15 [Hear,] O Kotharat,

<daughters of> Ellil, [the Brigh]t Ones!
Yarih the luminary of the heavens sent a message
to Har[ha]b king of circumcision.

'Give Nikkal!
Yarih would pay the bride-price for Ib;
let her enter his household!

1.24 R 20 And I shall give her dowry[15] to her father,
a thousand (shekels) of silver
and ten thousand of gold!

I shall send gems of lapis lazuli!

I shall turn her steppelands into vineyards,
the steppeland of her love into orchards![16]'

But Harhab king of circumcision replied,

1.24 R 25 'O most gracious of the gods,
lower edge become son-in-law to Baal;
wed Pidray his daughter[17].

12. For a very different estimate of ll. 7-10 see Margalit (1979: 556 §6.2).

13. Text 11[ ]*mm*12*nh* 'her bowels'? Or read perhaps [ ]*mm*[.]<'>*nh*: '...her vulva...' (so above) as in l. 8. De Moor (1987: 143), 'the waters of her "well"' (sc. vulva). The *n* at the beginning of l. 12 may be *'n*: the tablet surface is damaged.

14. The town of Tuttul on the Euphrates was an important cult-centre of Dagan. He is also invoked in KTU 1.100.15.

15. Ug. *mhrh*. The dowry is a financial settlement her father sets aside for the bride. In addition to paying the bride-price (*trḫ*), Yarih is so insistent that he offers to pay the dowry as well. Cf. Shechem's eagerness at Gen. 34.12.

16. An agricultural metaphor for the consummation and fruitful outcome of a marriage.

17. Text: *pdry b*[*th*]. Thus Goetze (1941: 369), Herdner (1968: 20). Many, e.g., Herrmann (1968: 19) read *b*[*t*] <*ar*>, 'daughter of light' or 'mist', Driver (1956:

I shall introduce you to her father Baal.
Athtar[18] will intercede[19].

V He will betroth to you Yabradmay[20],
1.24 V 30 His father's daughter Lion[21] will arouse!'[22]

But Yarih the luminary of the heavens replied,[23]
'With Nikkal will be my wedding!'

Afterwards Yarih pays the bride-price for Nikkal.

Her father set the beams of the scales,
1.24 V 35 her mother the trays of the scales.

Her brothers arranged the ingots,
her sisters the stones of the scales[24].

125), 'honey dew', de Moor (1987: 144), Pidray's epithet in KTU 1.3 i 23-24 etc. (See nn. 11, 12 at KTU 1.3 i 23.)

18. Text *ṯtr.tt* (*KTU*^{2}). "Aštart', 'Astarte...': Virolleaud (1936a: 220) and Gordon (1937: 32: contrast 1977: 66) Verb *ygṯr* is m. The two *t*s with *rḫ*, others. Otherwise *rḫlk*, 'your ewe' (sc. bride): Virolleaud (1936a: 220).

19. Ug. *ygṯr*: Thus del Olmo (1981a: 608): Heb. *'ātar*, Ar. *'atara*, though the use of these verbs is exclusively cultic. 'Is jealous' (Gt of *ġr*, Ar. *ġara*): Caquot (1974: 394) and Gibson (1978: 129, 155). Reading *ygpr*: Virolleaud (1936a: 221); Driver (1956: 143): 'arranged' (Ar. *ġafara*). Astour (1969: 9): 'Athtar covers (her) with a veil'.

20. Margalit (1980: 149 n. 2) makes *ybrdmy* ('Water-dispenser') an epithet of Athtar himself (whom he interprets as a god of irrigation: Margalit 1996). He thus has him as a fellow-matchmaker. My interpretation makes *ybrdmy* a further candidate (along with Pidray) offered as a substitute for Nikkal. Thus others, e.g., Gibson (1978: 129). Astour (1969: 10) wonders whether *ybrdmy* is an epithet of Taliy (appearing with Pidray and Arsiy in KTU 1.3 i, ii). This is not implausible, though we might expect it to be f. (**ybrdtmy*), unless the *t* has been assimilated, a solution assumed above.

21. Sc. a title of Athtar. Cf. the iconography of Ishtar, in which the goddess regularly appears on a lion. Evidently it is a sister of Athtar's that he will supply. Perhaps Ishhara? For Driver (1956: 125 n. 16) the lion is Baal. Del Olmo (1981: 459), reads *lbu* as asseverative *l* with *bu* imper., 'come!' But the prosody is then skewed.

22. There is wide variation in interpretations of these four cola. The version above is provisional.

23. I have omitted {wn'n} from the text at this point. For notes on this see del Olmo (1981a: 460).

24. Once the romantic aspect is settled, it becomes a pecuniary transaction: a bride is bought as a commodity!

Nikkal-and-Ib (it is) of whom I sing.

Bright is Yarih,
and may Yarih shine on you[25]!

1.24 V 40 I sing of the goddess[es], the Kothar[at][26],
[daugh]ters of Ellil, the Bright Ones,
daughters of Ellil, lord of Gamlu[27],

who go down to the nut-groves
and among the olive-groves.[28]

...

1.24 V 45 to the Wise One, the perceptive god.

Lo,
in my mouth is their number,
on my lips is the sum[29] of them:

25. Thus the power of the myth is invoked for other marriages. The idea that moonlight is especially auspicious for lovers appears to have an ancient pedigree.

26. As their names indicate, these are goddesses involved in pregnancy and childbirth. Cf. their role in KTU 1.17 ii 24-47. For Ginsberg (1938) they are merely human. Rather are they a group of seven goddesses, corresponding to the Akk. *sa-sú-ra-tu*$_4$, (KTU 1.47.13 below) and to ^{d}NIN.MAḪ. See Pardee (1995), *šassūrātu*, *CAD*, XVII [Š/2], p. 145.

27. As Gallagher notes (1994: 136), the title used here *b'l gml*, usually construed as 'Lord of the Sickle' and supposed to refer to the lunar crescent, e.g. Caquot (1974: 396 n. b), may also mean 'Lord of Gamlu (= the constellation Auriga)', a title of Enlil-Ellil. See n. 6.

28. The translation of this bicolon is tentative.

29. Ug. *mnthn*. 'Their formula (of invocation)': Caquot and Sznycer (1974: 396 n. g), citing Akk. *minutu*. 'Her number...her counting': Watson (1976a: 438), who takes this to be a reference to the pregnant woman counting her months (cf. KTU 1.23.<52ab>, 56-57). If the translation is correct, it is a circumstantial argument against Watson's interesting approach outlined in n. 35, since we should not expect an enumeration of only two goddesses to evoke such a statement, while an enumeration of seven would justify it. The number seven is also perhaps intrinsically more likely if the goddesses also represent not merely midwives, but protective and benevolent spirits who communicate their personal traits to the new-born, thus transmitting its character. Cf. the spirits provided at Isa. 11.2, which are seven in number if the 'spirit of Yahweh' at the head of the v. is to be distinguished from the six following. Cf. also the seven Baals of KTU 1.47.5-11 and parallels, and the anointings (if correctly interpreted), at Ps. 19.8-10, though these are only five or at most six in number (Wyatt 1995b: 568-69, 588-91).

Trousseau and Dowry[30],
Cord-Cutter[31] and Womb-Opener[32],
Breather-of-Breath with Perubahsh[33]
24 V 50 (and) Goodness[34], the youngest of the Kotharat![35]

30. Ug. *tlḫhw*, *mlghy*. Seemingly subdivisions of the *mohar* ('dowry'), perhaps dating from an era of more archaic procedures. Cf. Heb. *šilluḥîm*, *mᵉlôg* (Akk. *mulūgu*).

31. Ug. *ttqt*. Following de Moor's suggestion (n. 33 below). Or is the name perhaps to be explained by reference to √*šqy*, as a suckling-goddess? The Gt form is hard to explain on this proposal, however. 'The One who gives suck'?

32. Ug. *bq't*. √*bq'*, 'cleave, split'.

33. *tq't* and *prbḫt*. √*tq'*, Heb. *tāqa'*, 'give a blast (on a horn)'. The second name is so far unexplained. Cf. the Hittite PN Peruwaḫšu, cit. Caquot (1974: 397 n. l), who construes these lines quite differently, and takes P. to be the recipient of the tablet). For these explanations of the names see de Moor (1987: 145). Watson (below) divides as *pr bḫt*.

34. Ug. *dmqt*. Or, 'Most Beautiful': Jirku (1962: 79); 'the Good One': de Moor (1987: 145).

35. The final lines perhaps comprise a list, to be learnt by heart as part of the ritualization of pregnancy and birth. I have followed the majority view here. Cf. Aistleitner (1964: 640), del Olmo (1981a: 461) and de Moor (1987: 145). An entirely different approach is taken by Watson (1976a: 438-9), whose interpretation and translation is attractive, and worth citing in full:

> See! In my mouth is her number,
> on my lips her counting.
> O you, established (?) as her dot and dowry
> From her, Wise women, do not cut off (?)
> From her the 'fruit' with care,
> O experts in babycraft, O Kathiratu!

He takes the Kotharat to be two in number, as mid-wives; cf. Exod. 1.15 and the birth-goddesses of Egyptian birth-scenes. What is being counted on this interpretation is the mother's months of pregnancy (to which cf. KTU 1.23.51< >, 56-57). However, the forms *sprhn*, *mnthn* cannot mean 'her number, her counting', referring back to the mother, but must mean 'their number...', referring to the months. The suff. *-hn* is not 3 f. sg., which is *-h* or *-n*, though Watson interprets it as 'perhaps energic 3 fem. sing.', but 3 f. pl. (*UT*, 36-37 §6.7, 8, 13). This would raise the problem, unless his explanation be accepted, that since months have not been mentioned, there is no antecedent to which the suffixes can refer. Cf. also at n. 29.

KTU 1.40: A Liturgy for a Rite of Atonement for the People of Ugarit

(KTU 1.40 = CTA 32 = UT 2 = RS 1.002+1.002A)

Select Bibliography

Aistleitner 1954, 1964: 105-107; Caquot 1962; Weippert 1969; van Selms 1971; Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín 1975d; Xella 1981: 256-67; de Tarragon 1989: 140-51; de Moor and Sanders 1991; Pardee 1991, 2000: 92-142, 2001a: 81-97; del Olmo 1992a: 99-109; de Tarragon 1998.

This ritual text is partially duplicated by KTU 1.84. An atonement liturgy, originally of five or more probably six (Pardee, de Moor and Sanders, del Olmo) similar sections, of which five survive (the first two in extremely fragmentary condition). The highly repetitive and formulaic nature of the text allows a considerable degree of restoration. The sections are addressed to men and women respectively, in order, perhaps offering three kinds of victim (I-II ox[?], III-IV sheep, V-VI donkey). This great 'Day of Atonement' liturgy seems to be an analogue of the rite of Lev. 16 (de Moor and Sanders 1991). It affords a precious glimpse into Ugaritic ethical mores.

[I]			(Entire first section missing)[1]	
(m.)				
1.40 R	1	[	] and atonement[2] [	]
[II]		[	and] atonement for U[garit	]
(f.)		[	] whether the [	]

1. See Pardee (1991: 1189) for formal arguments for a sixth section.

2. Ug. *npy*. Very diverse interpretations have been proposed, e.g 'exalt': (Caquot 1962: 206-207: Ar. *nāfa*); 'repudiated, disowned': Aistleitner (1964: 105; *WUS*, 209 §1816: Ar. *nafā*); 'fabric': van Selms (1971: 236: Ph. *npy*, 'weave'); 'banishment': Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín (1975d: 151); cf. 'censure': Xella (1981: 257); 'guarantee': de Tarragon (1989: 144 n. 29: Akk. *nepû*); 'be virtuous': de Moor and Sanders (1991: 290: √*ypy*, 'become beautiful'); 'well-being': Pardee (1991: 1191: √*wpy*, *ypy*); 'expiation': del Olmo (1992a: 99, 106: Akk. *nap*[*p*]*û* 'sieve, select', cf. Heb. *nûp*, *nāpâ* etc.). I have followed Pardee's argument here, and on his explanation ('being made...*whole*') the obvious technical equivalent in English is 'atonement'. (The Heb. technical term √*kpr*, does not appear in Ug.) It is not clear whether these four lines belong to section I or section II.

[ ] *ǵbr*[3] [ ]

1.40 R 5

(no further surviving text)

[III]
(m.) (ll. 9-17: only odd letters surviving)

[IV] [Now we present[4] a ram for purification[5],]
(f.) [for purification of the women of Ugarit,]
[and ato]nement for the foreigner [within the walls[6] of Ugarit,]
[and atone]ment [for Yaman[7],]
and atone[ment for *'rmt*[8],]
[and atonement for Ugarit].

Whenever y[ou] sin,
[whether by the accusation[9] of the Qa[tians,]

3. *DLU*, 155 leaves untranslated. Cf. n. 11.

4. Thus also de Moor and Sanders (1991: 284). Ug. *šqrb*. Lit. 'bring near': technical term, as in Exod. 29.3 etc. (√*qrb* hiph.). Presumably into the presence of the divine image. I have taken it as inf. abs. used finitely, as is common in the narrative poetry. It may alternatively be an imper. sg., addressed to the priest who brings the victim in. See also del Olmo (1995: 42).

5. Ug. *mšr*. 'Song': Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín (1975a: 150) and de Tarragon (1989: 146). 'Singer...song': Aistleitner (1964: 106; dividing *mšrm šr*). Cf. van Selms (1971: 236). 'Drag off': de Moor and Sanders (1991: 284, 290). I fail to see what this means. 'Rectitude': Pardee (1991: 1185, 1190; Akk. *mêšaru*). Cf. 'justification': del Olmo (1990; 1992a: 101).

6. Ug. *ḥmyt*. Thus most. Van Selms (1971: 236): 'fortresses'.

7. TN? Cf. KTU 1.4 i 43 and Astour (1967: 352).

8. Corrected by some to *ṯrmn*. See *CTA*, 114 n. 7. Caquot (1962: 206) sees this as a district of the kingdom of Ugarit.

9. Ug. *ulp*, preceding lists of peoples. Following Pardee (1991) I analyse as *u* + *l* + *p*: 'whether (or, and) from the mouth (of)'. Pardee translates as 'according to the statement of'. I take this to mean 'according to the accusation', within the liturgical context or generally. Does it mean, as my translation suggests, that representatives of these foreign nationals and classes of people participate in the rite, and state their peoples' grievances, for which communal forgiveness is sought? Or are the people listed sharing in the rite by confessing their own sins? 'According to the manner of...': Caquot (1962: 208); cf. 'like': Xella (1981: 258, 262-63); 'allied': Aistleitner (1964: 105; 22 *WUS*, §243); 'prince, chief': Gordon (*UT*, 359 §19.202),

1.40 R 20 or by the accusation of the Dadm]ians[10],
or by the accusation of [the Hurrians],
[or by] the accusation of the Hittites,
or by the accusation of [the Cypriots],
[or by the accusation of] the *ǵbr*[11],
or by the accusation of] your oppressed ones,
or by the accusation of yo[ur poo]r[12],
or by the accusation of *q*[*rzbl*[13]];

whenever you sin,
either through your anger,
or through your impat[ience],
[or through some evil] you have done;

whenever you sin
concerning the <sa>crifices and the offering,
[our] sacrifi[ce we of]fer:
this is the offering we make,

van Selms (1971: 237) and de Tarragon (1989: 146 etc.).

10. 'Qatians...Dadmians' (*qṭy, ddmy*): gentilics of uncertain reference. All the gentilics are sg., but collective in force. Cf. the same usage in the 'nation lists' such as Exod. 23.23 etc. Gordon (*UT*, 477 §19.2221; cf. Aistleitner 1964: 106 n. f) read the first term as *qṭš* in its only surviving instance (l. 36), and took it to be a dialectal form of *qdš* (perhaps 'Qadeshite'), but the *y* is the safer reading, and expected with a gentilic. Cf. Caquot (1962: 207), who reads [*qtš*]*y* at l. 19 (11 in *CTA* numbering). See also Weippert (1969), Eg. Qadi. Error for *qṭ<n>y*: 'Qatnians', sc. citizens of Qatna? The term *dadmum* is the Amorite equivalent of Akk. *mâtum*, 'country' (Durand 1993: 50). Were the 'Dadmians' perhaps no more than the rural population?

11. Read as *šbr*, 'Subarean', by Caquot (1962: 207, with '[?]'), Aistleitner (1964: 105). Cf. n. 3.

12. The two cola ending 'oppressed ones...poor' are translated thus by Caquot (1962: 209):

> either because of your culpability
> or because of your degradation.

The term *ḫbt* is translated 'plunderer' (Akk. *ḫabātu*) by Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín (1975a: 153).

13. Interpreted as a TN by Astour (1975: 327 §96): modern Karzbil. This would translate as 'Princeton'. But it seems out of place last in the list, unless we conjecture a military defeat, or some reason for a sense of injustice against Ugarit. Van Selms (1971: 239): 'the raging(?) prince' (*ulp qrzbl*).

this is the victim we immolate[14].

May it be borne aloft[15] [to the father of the gods[16]],
1.40 R 25 may it be borne aloft to the pantheon of the gods,
may it be borne aloft to the assembly of the go[ds],
[to Thukamun and Sha]nim:
here is the ram.

[V] Now we present a donkey[17] for purification,
(m.) for purification of the men of Ugarit,
and [atonement for <the foreigner within the walls of>]
Ugari<t>,
and atonement for Yaman,
and atonement for *'rmt*,
and atonement for [Ugarit],
and atonement for Niqmad[18].

Whenever your state of grace be changed[19],
whether by the accusation of the Qa[tians,
or by the accusation of the Dadm]ians,

14. In each of these formulae, the vb and n. use the same etymon (*dbḥn ndbḥn*, *ṯ nṯ'y*, *nkt nkt*). For the last clause, I follow Xella (1981: 258) and del Olmo (1995: 40), who have exactly the right form of words. On the rank of the person performing *ṯ*, see Freilich (1992). It is not three kinds of sacrifice, but two technical terms qualifying the generic 'sacrifice'.

15. Sc. as a holocaust, according to Caquot (1962: 210).

16. Ug. *ab bn il*. Or 'father of the sons of El', but such a translation would be tautologous. The form *bn il* occurs in the following two cola as well.

17. Ug. *'r*. Read as *tr* (= *ṯr*), 'bull', by Caquot (1962: 206) and Aistleitner (1964: 106). Eliezer Oren has drawn my attention to ritual donkey burials (following sacrifice?) at MBA Tell Ajjul and Tell Haror. The name of Shechem's father in Gen. 34, Hamor, suggests a treaty-sacrifice involving donkeys, which is attested at Mari (ARM 2.37) and has been discussed by Noth (1966). The only other text from Ugarit to mention donkeys used in sacrificial rites is KTU 1.119.16, and this, together with the present national day of atonement, suggests that they were reserved for special occasions, and consequently with all the greater significance attached to their use. The text at KTU 1.6 i 28 may refer to donkeys, but the term used, if not restored to *yḥmrm*, is *ḥmrm*, not *'r* as here. See n. 68 *ad loc*. See also n. 123 to KTU 1.4 iv 4.

18. The identity of the king is not certain, though Niqmad III is the likely candidate. See nn. 9 and 11 to KTU 1.113.12, 19 and n. 27 to KTU 1.161.13.

19. Ug. *šn*. Or: 'marred'. See del Olmo (1989a: 52) and de Moor and Sanders (1991: 292-93).

or by the accusation of the the Hurrians,
or by the accusation of the Hittites,
or by the accusation of the Cypriots,
or by the [accusation of the *ǵbr*,
1.40 R 30 or by the accusation of] your oppressed ones,
or by the accusation of your p[oo]r,
or by the accusation of *qrzbl*;

whenever your state of grace be changed,
either through your anger,
or through your impatience,
or through some evil you have done;

whenever your state of grace be changed
concerning the sacrifices and the offering,
our sacrifice we offer:
this is the offering we make,
this is the victim we immolate.

May it be borne aloft to the father of the gods,
may it be borne aloft to the pantheon of the gods,
<to the assembly of the gods,>
to Thukamun and Shanim:
here is the donkey.

[VI] 35 Now repeat[20] the liturgy for puri[fication],
(f.) for purification of the wo<me>n of Ugarit,
and atonement for the foreigner within the walls of Ugarit,
and [atone]ment for his wife[21].

Whenever your[22] state of grace be changed,
whether by the accusation of the Qa[tians,
or by the accusation of the Dadm]ians,

20. Or: 'return to'. Perhaps 'we repeat' as with *šqrb* above. On the expression cf. KTU 1.4 v 42; 1.19 iv 63.

21. Ug. *aṯt*. Or: 'the women'. Originally read *nṯt*, and taken to be 'Nesheti' or similar, the name of the queen of the Niqmad previously mentioned in l. 28. See Virolleaud (1936d: 43 n. 3), *CTA* (p. 115 n. 2), de Moor and Sanders (1991: 290). See now, however, Pardee (1991: 1186 n. 7). If *aṯt* is sg., it may refer not to the king's wife, but to the foreigner's (the immediate antecedent).

22. The suffix is f. pl., as are all suffixes in the section.

or by the [accusation of the the Hu]rrians,
or by the accusation of the Hittites,
or by the accusation of the Cypriots,
or by the accusation of the *ǵbr*,
or by the accusation of your op[pressed] ones,
or by the accusation of your p[oo]r,
or by the accusation of *qrzbl*;

whenever your state of grace be changed,
either through [your] anger,
[or through your impat]ience,
1.40 R 40 or through some evil you have done;

whenever [your state] of grace be changed
[concerning the sacrifices] and the offering,
our sacrifice we offer:
this is the offering we [make],
[this is the victim we] immolate.

May it be borne aloft to the father of the gods,
1.40 V 42 may it be borne aloft to the pan[theon of the gods],
[to] the assembly of the gods,
to Thukamun [and Shanim]:
here is the donkey.

KTU 1.41: Instructions for the Ritual Calendar of the Month of Vintage

(KTU 1.41 = CTA 35 = UT 3 = RS 1.003)

Select Bibliography

Herdner 1956; de Moor 1972: 13-17, 1987: 157-65; Xella 1981: 59-75; de Tarragon 1989: 152-60; del Olmo 1987b, 1992a: 50-51, 73-87; Levine and de Tarragon 1993, 1997a; Aboud 1994: 172-77; Pardee 2000: 143-213, 2001a: 55-65.

This text is duplicated by KTU 1.87, which allows a confident restoration of many lacunae. It is in prose, in the form of a calendar of cultic obligations during the month of Vintage ('First-of-the-Wine'). This was the period of the New Year, and some scholars (de Moor, del Olmo) have stressed this aspect of the contents. It is noteworthy that the king plays a key part in the rites of the vintage, whose economic importance would be considerable. It is uncertain which temple was the location of the rites.

1.41 R 1 In the month of [First-of-the-Wine[1], on the day of the new moon, a bunch of grapes] is to be cut[2] [for El as communion-offering.]

On the thir[teenth (day) the king is to wash himself thoroughly].[3]

1.41 R 5 On the four[teenth the first of the tribute,] and two rams

1. The *premier cru* was evidently as appreciated in Ugarit as in Bordeaux!

2. Ug. *šmtr*. *Hapax*, explained from Ar. *matara*, 'cut' (de Tarragon 1989: 153 n. 42). Imper.: Xella (1981: 64), de Moor (1987: 158) and Tropper (1990: 42). We may ask whether the harvesting of the grape-bunch in Num. 13.23 (now a pseudo-historical episode) does not have its roots in a similar ritual tradition. The subsequent typological use of this motif emphasizes its symbolic thrust. On the problem of how to translate the vbs in this text, descriptively or prescriptively, see Levine (1983: 469) who argues that where a volitive is required it is always indicated, and Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 78). I have chosen a form which can be taken either way.

3. Ug. *brr*. Lit. 'clean, purified' (Heb. *bārûr*): *UT*, 377 §19.528. Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 91) apply it as an epithet to the king: 'the purified king...'. See also KTU 1.119.5.

to [the Mistress of the Temples[4]; two birds to the divine [people[5]]; and a ram (and) a ja[r[6] to Ilsh[7]; a ram to the gods[8].]
[The king] shall sit[9], being purified[10], and [shall clap his hands[11] and shall proclaim] the day[12]. Subsequently[13] he is to en[ter[14] the temple]. A gift [[15], two ewes],

4. Ug. *b'lt bhtm*. I see no reason to identify this tutelary goddess with Anat, as does de Moor (1987: 159 n. 11). The form *bhtm* is pl.

5. Ug. *inš* (*ilm*). Some leave untranslated. De Moor (1987: 159: cf. *WUS*, 28 §319; *UT*, 362-63 §19.268; *DLU*, 41): 'the Most Amiable (of the gods)', which he takes to be an epithet of Baal; del Olmo (1992a: 74: cf. *WUS*, 28 §318; *UT*, 363 §19.269): '(the divine) retinue', cf. Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 91): 'the staff (of the gods)', sc. the temple personnel. Why do they receive sacrifices? The fact supports del Olmo's view that they are dead, divinized, kings.

6. Ug. *dd*. Thus Xella (1981: 61), de Moor (1987: 159) and del Olmo (1992a: 74). Cf. *DLU*, 129, *dd* II. De Tarragon (1989: 153): 'a ram for the well-beloved Ilš'. Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 91): 'Elš, the favored'. But an epithet would not normally precede its noun, except in a noun clause.

7. Minor god. De Moor identifies him as a raven-messenger (1987: 159 n. 13). See also Korpel (1990: 292) and Becking (1995a). He appears with his wife at KTU 1.16 iv 3-4.

8. Apparently an unusual use of *ilhm* (cf. Heb. *ʾĕlōhîm*) for 'gods'. Usual pl. form is *ilm*. But cf. n. 20.

9. Ug. *ytb*. 'Sit': Xella (1981: 61), de Tarragon (1989: 154) and del Olmo (1992a: 74); 'is seated': Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 91). 'Return', de Moor (1987: 159).

10. Ug. *brr*, as at l. 3. On the language of royal purification as (temporary) divinization see Wyatt 1999; *idem* 2000.

11. Cf. l. 54, where the same sense should be understood. See Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 94-95). Cf. the sense commonly drawn: 'he shall wipe his face' (e.g., de Moor 1987: 159).

12. Ug. [*qra*] *ym*. For de Moor (1987: 159 n. 17) it is New Year's day (on the fourteenth of the month!); for del Olmo (1992a: 74) a festival day. The fourteenth would be a full moon. Cf. Lev. 23.21 (*qārāʾ yôm*). For de Tarragon (1989: 154 n. 47) *ym* could refer to a deity invoked (*qra*) by the king, 'Day' (thus de Moor 1981: 14; otherwise unattested at Ugarit? See Becking 1995d) or less probably Yam.

13. Ug. *'lm*. Thus Xella (1981: 61). 'Furthermore': de Tarragon (1989: 154), del Olmo (1992a: 74). 'On the following day' (sc. the fifteenth): de Moor (1982: 14; 1987: 160).

14. Ug. *y'*[*rb*]. Intrans.? Trans. (D stem passive) according to de Tarragon (1989: 154 n. 48), but intrans. in Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 91).

15. Text usually read as [ ]*k.'gml* [...]. Read as [*y*]*tk 'gml*, 'one pours (liquid) *'gml*': de Tarragon (1989: 154); as [ ]*tk* 'gm*l* by del Olmo (1992a: 74): '[ins]ide the

1.41 R 10 and a [fe]ral pige[on[16]] he shall of[fer[17] to Anat], and an o[x and a ram to] El. And by the win[dow][18] he shall pour (a libation)[19]. A heifer to the two gods[20], Thu-[kamun and Shanim]; a ewe to Reshef, <a ewe> as a holocaust. And (as) communion sacrifices[21]: two ewes to his god[22]; an ox and a ram to the gods, a heifer to the
1.41 R 15 gods; to Baal a ram; to Athirat [a ram; to Thuka]mun and [Shanim a ram;] to Anat a ram; to Reshef a ram; [to the pantheon of El[23] and the assembly of Baal] a heifer; to Shalem [a heifer].

[And at midday[24] in the retiring]-room[25] of the god[s]

'gm*l*' (note that transliteration and translation do not match). De Moor (1972: 14 and n. 40; 1987: 160 and n. 20), takes *'gml* to denote some hypothetical mythical monster. Xella (1981: 61, 65) wonders whether it is not an error for *'glm*, 'two calves'. Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 91, 95): '[with] a present of [a cu]p and a chal[ice]', reading *tgml* [*k*]*s wsp*[*l*], rejecting initial *k*.

16. Ug. *yn*[*t q*]*rt*. Lit. 'town-pigeon'. At any rate an ancient equivalent of the feral pigeon.

17. Cf. del Olmo (1995: 42) though he does not appear to have noticed this example.

18. Xella (1981: 61): 'and in the [sacrificial] ap[erture]'; del Olmo (1995: 46): 'and in the ni[che of his]': *b*[*urbth*$^{?}$], presumably referring to the niche where the cult-image of El was placed. De Moor (1987: 160): 'lattice'; de Tarragon (1989: 154): 'opening'. Cf. n. 1 to KTU 1.43.1.

19. Ug. *ytk*. √*ntk*, 'pour libations': del Olmo (1995: 46), also Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 91). Or is it an error for *ykt* (√*nkt*), 'immolate' (del Olmo 1995: 40), with the *gdlt* and all the subsequent animals as victims? The mention of a libation in the midst of a series of blood-sacrifices looks odd, unless it marks the beginning of the following sequence of sacrifices. But note the libations in l. 19.

20. Ug. *ilhm*. A du., as suggested by the context. The pl. is normally *ilm*, thought the form *ilhm* (twice) in l. 14 appears to be pl.

21. In terms of syntax, the phrase *wšlmm*, 'and a communion sacrifice', may go with the preceding mention of Reshef (Xella and del Olmo) or with the following *ilh* (de Moor and de Tarragon). The latter is preferable. *šrp*, 'holocaust' may then qualify the preceding offerings to the gods, Thukamun and Shanim and Reshef.

22. Ug. *ilh*. Hardly to be read as the equivalent of Heb. *'eloâ*, as proposed by de Moor (1987: 160 n. 28). I take it to be the king's personal deity, who might naturally take precedence when he was performing the rites. Others leave as an unspecific DN.

23. Ug. *dr il*. Or: 'the pantheon of the gods' (lit. 'the divine pantheon').

24. Ug. *burm*. De Tarragon (1989: 155, after Levine 1983: 472), Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 92, 95-96): 'at midday'. 'Into the fire': de Moor (1972: 14), Xella

(and) lords[26]]: thirty[27] [full[28] chalices[29] and] cups[30]. And
1.41 R 20 the gift[31] that he is to take to the royal chapel: an offering
of [myrrh-oil] (and one) of spiced oil[32], honey[33] (as) a

(1981: 61). 'As a sacrifice of combustion': del Olmo (1992a: 75; cf. 1995: 46); but it would scarcely take place in the retiring-room. De Moor (1987: 161): 'in the greenery', linking it to Sukkôt. Cf. Pardee (2000: 56-59).

25. Ug. [*lb*] *rmṣt*. Or: 'robing-room'. An adjacent part of the temple for ritual preparations. Rather than 'a roast heart' (cf. for instance de Moor [1987: 161] and del Olmo [1992a: 77]), since *lb rmṣt* cannot be so construed, for *lb* is m. (though *DLU* lists both m. and f.; f. in Heb. found only at Prov. 12.15). For explanation of the phrase (prep. *l* + *b* , 'inside'; *rmṣt* from √*rbṣ* with dissimilation of *b* to *m*) and critique of the earlier approach see Levine and de Tarragon (1993, 96). Lit. 'sitting-room'.

26. Ug. *ilhm* [*b'lm*]. At first glance the 'Baal-gods': cf. in the pantheon-list KTU 1.47.6-11 and parallels ('Adad II-VII' in the Akk. text). De Moor (1987: 161 n. 33) identifies the gods mentioned here with the double-category reference in l. 16. The new approach of Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 92, 95-96), reflected in the translation, is however much more convincing. The 'lords' are the king and his chief officials in attendance. Not so for Pardee (2000: 59-60).

27. One each day of the month, or thirty together?

28. The term *mlu*([*u*]) appears twice in most readings (e.g. *KTU*^{2}). See Levine (1983: 470), Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 77) for the rationale for omitting the first reference (restored from KTU 1.87.20, an erroneous or variant copy of KTU 1.41.18).

29. Ug. *dṯt* (*dṯ ṯ* of *KTU*^{2} typographic error). De Tarragon (1989: 137 n. 17), Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 96) construe this with Eg-Sem. *daši*, 'cup' (*CAD*, (D), 119: EA 14 i 48). Xella (1981: 61) and de Moor (1987: 161): 'fat ashes'. Cf. Heb. *dešen*. Del Olmo (1992: 75): 'fodder' (after Sanmartín 1980: 336-37). Cf. Heb. *deše'*, and *DLU*, 138, 'fodder and spring grass' (cit. Akk. *dīšu, dēšutu*).

30. Ug. *ksm*. For this approach see Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 92). Note the different approach of Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 177), de Moor (1987: 161) and del Olmo (1992a: 75). They see this as 'emmer-corn' (cf. Heb. *kusemet*), and link it with *ksm*(*h*) in KTU 1.17 i 31—see n. 38 *ad loc.*—(an offering the son makes for his father) and with *kśm* (note the use of the different *s* sign) in KTU 1.39.9, where the same expression occurs. Whichever interpretation is followed, *dṯt wksm* is a hendiadys. See now Pardee (2000: 60-61).

31. Ug. *m'rb*. 'Offering': Xella (1981: 61); 'tribute-offering': del Olmo (1992a: 75); 'temple dues': de Moor (1987: 161 and n. 36; Akk. *irbu, eribtu*); 'present' (n.): de Tarragon (1989: 155; Akk. *irbu*); 'pledge': Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 92, 96; Akk. *irbu*, Heb. *ma'arāb*).

32. Ug. *šmn rqḥ*. Or: 'blended oil' (thus Levine and de Tarragon 1993: 92). Heb. √*rqḥ*. 'Perfumed oil': Xella (1981: 62) and del Olmo (1992a: 75).

33. On honey in the cult see n. 15 to KTU 1.ii [21], n. 50 to KTU 1.14 ii 19 and

gift, [and feral pigeons in two baskets[34]].

And into the hole[35], four[teen] pitchers of wine; a measure[36] of flour on the ste[ps of] the altar; for the sanctuary of the goddess, two bir[ds].

1.41 R 25 [To Saphon[37], a ram]; to the sacred bride[38] a ram and to [; to Yarih] a heifer; to Nikkal [a heifer; to the Mistress of the Temples two] birds; to the [divine] people [a heifer]; to the go[ds] a ewe; Sha[psh[39] a heifer; Resh]ef a holocaust and commun[ion sacrifice; ditto, two ewes.]

1.41 R 30 His [go]d a heifer; [the gods a heifer; El[40] a e]we;

lower edge Thukamun and Sha[nim a ewe;]

1.41 V [the goddess of] the temple[41] two ewes, at [the spring[42] a

n. 15 to KTU 1.148.22.

34. Ug. *ḫtm*. 'Basket, nest': Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 92, 96: Akk. *ḫīšû*). Others: 'loaves' (de Moor 1972: 15; Ar. *ḫuṯṯ*). I take *ynt qrt* to be pl. (conceivably du.) rather than sg. on account of the *two* containers, in which the birds are conveyed.

35. Ug. *ǵr*. Usually construed as √*ǵr*, 'mountain' (= Heb. *ṣûr*). Thus de Moor (1987: 162), explained as temple-mound as replica of Mt Saphon. Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 92, 97): 'ledge' ('a ledge in the courtyard'). It is a place of libation, evidently with some symbolic significance. Alternatively, it may be a depression, (*bǵr*: 'into the hole'?) a suitable place for libations. Cf. √*ǵr*, 'go down' (Rainey 1971: 172) and Xella's (1981: 67) and de Tarragon's (1989: 155 n. 55) remarks. I have chosen the latter alternative partly on the force of *b*, 'into' rather than 'onto'. To de Tarragon's remarks, cf. the holes in the rock under the Dome of the Rock, supposedly the locus of libations in the Jerusalem cult. See Patai (1947: 58).

36. Ug. *prs*. Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 92): '½ measure'. But any measure is already a division (√*prs*).

37. The mountain is deified and receives sacrifice.

38. Ug. *ǵlmt*. While etymologically neutral ('young woman') this term and its m. equivalent is used exclusively of royalty and deities, and therefore clearly carries an ideological burden. Cf. *'almâ* in Isa. 7.14, which denotes the queen. See KTU 1.2 i 13 and n. 99.

39. Note that the dative *l* is omitted between ll. 28 and 33.

40. Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 92) treat this as a dittograph for the preceding *ilhm*, 'gods'.

41. Ug. [*ilt*] *bt*. A goddess distinct from 'the mistress of the temples' (*b'lt bhtm*) of l. 26? Or is the latter 'the mistresses...', with 'the goddess' one of their number? Cf. also *b'lt* [*btm rmm*], l. 37 below.

42. Ug. *nbk*. The *mbk* in KTU 1.2 iii 4 etc. is the point of junction at the centre

holocaust and communion sacrifice;] ditto a heifer; to B[aal of Saphon] a l[am]b; to Saphon a heifer; to [Baal]
1.41 V 35 of U[ga]rit a ram; to the go[d] of the ancestor [ ].
[to Athirat], and two [b]irds to...[[43]] times, both in [the sanct]uary[44] of the Mistress of the [Great] Templ[es and on the al]tars.
On the fifth (day): (at) [the sanctuary[45] of El, a shekel
1.41 V 40 of sil]ver as *kubadu*-offering[46] and a sacrifice[47]; [ ] to Athirat; two birds [to the divine people].

[Re]turn[48] to the altar of Baal. A hei[fer to Baal]; a ewe to Saphon and a lamb [to Baal of Ugarit.]

Twenty-two times [ ] a ram, a jar of oil, (and) a heifer.

of the world of the two cosmic seas (Ug. *thmtm* [cf. Ps. 42.8 MT], Akk. *Apsû* and *Ti'amat*). The 'spring' here was probably a water-source in the temple-precinct, presumably a well or an artificial container (like the bronze sea in the Jerusalem temple—Kgs 7.23-6 = 2 Chron. 4.2-5), carrying this symbolic burden. Cf. the 'libation-hole' at l. 22 above. See also *nibkê-yām* in Job 38.16 and Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 97). (Interestingly, two local streams flowing to the west on the north and south sides of the city meet—a *mbk*!—just north-west of the tell. Is it possible that a cultic procession went out to this spot?)

43. Since *KTU*[1], all discussions and editions have read *tltm*, 'thirty', here. It is not found in either tablet. (Cf. *CTA* text, transcription and plate. Verso appears as pl. III in del Olmo 1992a). Is it to be inferred from the thirty vessels of l. 19? It is best taken as a conjecture.

44. As in l. 24, this *bt* must be a dwelling within one of the temples on the acropolis, where the tutelary guardian goddesses of the temples had their images, and therefore 'dwelt'. Hence 'sanctuary'. Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 92), who translate 'chapel', locate the ritual sequence in the Baal temple (see for instance l. 41). Note the following expression 'Mistress of the Great Temples'. These were undoubtedly the Baal and Dagan temples on the acropolis. (Here *btm* du.)

45. Cf. previous note, unless in this case a temple of El elsewhere in the city is meant. The only one known (and possibly dedicated to El) is the 'temple aux rhytons' in the city-centre. See n. 29 at KTU 1.3 ii 17.

46. That a specific ritual form is intended here by the term *kbd* (Akk. *kubādu*) has been convincingly argued by Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 98-102). See also Fleming (1992: 162-169) for the evidence from Emar.

47. Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 92, 101): 'sacred meal'.

48. Ug. [*t*] *tb*. I take it as š imper. 'They come back to...': de Tarragon (1989: 157). 'Repeat': Xella (1981: 62) and de Moor (1987: 164). Cf. del Olmo (1992a: 76). 'Pedestal': Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 93).

1.41 V 45 And [the king, being purified,] shall respond with a litany.

On the sixth (day) two [jars of oil] on top of it[49]; a heifer. [The king, being purified] shall res[pond] (with a litany).

On the se[ve]nth (day) as the sun declines the day is desacralized; at [s]un-s[e]t the king is desacralized[50]. And on the day of the new moon[51], two rams to [Athtar]t.

1.41 V 50 When the king [shall offer s]acrifice to Pirigal-*ṣqrn*[52] on the roof, on which stand four and four[53] dwellings[54] of cut branches[55], a ram as a holo[caust], an o[x] and a ram as communion-sacrifices. Seven times, with all his heart[56] the king shall s[peak]: As the sun declines the day

49. Sc. Baal's altar (l. 41).

50. As at l. 53. Presumably the first stage of desacralization takes some time in the late afternoon, culminating in the king's desacralization timed to be complete precisely as the sun touches the horizon. (Levine originally took an entirely different line: [1983: 471].) De Moor (1987: 164 and n. 55) interprets as 'the sun-set and the host of Maliku' (sc. deities invoked by the king). Cf. KTU 1.119.4 and n. 5 *ad loc*. Cf. n. 10 above.

51. Ug. *ym ḥdṯ*. This translation is apparently at odds with the preceding text, after the seven days of the feast have just ended. It could also mean '(on) the new day', sc. on the morrow. However, the text does recapitulate—e.g. l. 4, fourteenth day, l. 38, fifth day—so that a reversion to the first day is possible.

52. Ug. *prgl ṣqrn*. De Moor (1987: 165 n. 58) identifies this sequence as Sum. PIRIG.GAL NUN.GAL (a sage), the second part semitised as *ṣqrn*, explained by de Moor on basis of Ar. *ṣāqūrah*, 'third heaven'.

53. Sc. eight? Meaning 'two rows of four' according to Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 112).

54. Ug. *mṯbt*. 'Cabins': Xella (1981: 63); cf. de Moor (1987: 165) and de Tarragon (1989: 158). Preferable to 'stands': Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 112). We appear to have here an analogue of the Akk. *akîtu* and the Heb. *sukkôt*. The term also occurs at KTU 1.23.19. See n. 20 *ad loc*.

55. Ug. *azmr*. According to de Moor (1969a: 177 n. 68; followed by Xella 1981: 69; de Tarragon 1989: 158; del Olmo 1992a: 83), corresponds to Heb. *z^{e}mōrâ*, 'branch'. Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 113) relate it to Akk. (Neo-Ass.) *zamru*, 'a tree or shrub and its edible fruit'. De Moor (1971: 59) sees this as evidence for a Canaanite origin for the Israelite Feast of Tabernacles.

56. Ug. *klbh*. Thus Xella (1981: 63) and de Moor (1987: 165). Translated thus, it may mean 'in a clear voice', or 'sincerely', that is, reciting an appropriate litany or prayer. Alternatively read as 'all of it upon it' (*kl bh*): de Tarragon (1989: 158); 'each one on it (= the roof)': Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 112). Del Olmo (1992a: 83): '*ad libitum*'. Pardee (2000: 151): 'as his heart dictates'.

is desacralized; at sun-set the king is desacralized. And they shall ar[ray] him in fine clothes and shall wash his [face]. They shall r[et]urn him to his pa[lace], and when he is there, he shall r[aise his] hands to heaven.

KTU 1.87: Duplicate of KTU 1.41: The Variant Ending

(KTU 1.87 = CTA Appendix II = UT 173 = RS 18.056)

Select Bibliography

Xella 1981: 70-75; de Tarragon 1989: 159-60; del Olmo 1992: 50-51, 69, 73-87; Pardee 2000: 469-78, 2001a: 55-65.

The following excerpt from KTU 1.87, ll. 54-61, is the only portion of the text of that tablet not in common with KTU 1.41, and appears to be an alternative to ll. 50-55 above.

1.87 V 55 In the month of O[il-Harvest[1] on the fou]rteenth (day) the king is to wash himself thoroughly[2]. Subsequently a ram as ho[loc]aust to...At sunset the king is desacralized.

1.87 V 60 Ben-Aup[sh and Ben-Sbn the *Hzp*-ite: three;
Kotharmi[lk] (and) Ben-]*Ytrt*: five;
Ben-Gadakh (and) Mudda[3] [ ]: eight;
Krwn: five;
[ ]...three
...

1. Text *š*[ ]. *CTA* text reads *ši*[ ], but drawing only *š*[ ]; *KTU*^{2} *šm*[ ]. Tentatively restored *šmn*: Xella (1981: 74-75) and del Olmo (1992a: 85). This month-name is not otherwise attested at Ugarit (see Olivier [1972: 55 n. 5: Alalakh month-name *ša-am-me/ma*] and de Tarragon [1989: 160 n. 68]), and remains conjectural. Cf. Gezer calendar l. 1, *yrḥw 'sp*, 'his two months are (olive)-harvest'. See Albright (1943b: 22), who interprets *yrḥw* as du., contrasting it with *yrḥ* sg. De Jong and van Soldt (1987–88: 71) make no reference to such a month in their Ugaritic menology. But two months (June–July and July–August) remain to be identified.

2. Cf. KTU 1.41.3.

3. *CTA mḏ* on edge. Sc. beginning of a PN. *KTU*^{2} *tš'*, 'nine'.

KTU 1.43: Sacrifices and Votive Gifts in Palace Rituals

(KTU 1.43 = CTA 33 = UT 5 = RS 1.005)

Select Bibliography

Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín 1975–76; de Tarragon 1980: 98-107, 1989: 161-65; Xella 1981: 86-90; de Moor 1987: 168-71; del Olmo 1992a: 190-97; Pardee 1993a, 2000: 214-64, 2001a: 70-74.

A series of offerings, sacrificial and votive, to accompany various cultic processions within the palace precinct.

1.43 R 1 When Athtart-of-the-Window[1] enters the pit[2] in the royal palace, pour a libation[3] into the pit[4] of the

1. Ug. *ḫr*. Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín (1975f: 526) and de Tarragon (1989: 161): 'of the cavern'; cf. del Olmo (1992a: 191): 'of the tombs' (*ḫr*, Heb. *ḥôr*). 'Of the Hurrians': Nougayrol (1968a: 56) and Xella (1981: 87). Cf. Pardee (1993a: 302). Puech (1993) argues convincingly that this is the goddess encountered elsewhere, at Shuksi (RS 18.01.3, 6) and Baniyas, in Memphis and Seville, as 'Ashtart of the Window'. The iconographic motif of the goddess at the window is a frequent theme in IA Levantine ivories, and may lie behind the (ritual?) appearance of Jezebel at the window in 2 Kgs 9.30. Her act recalls the 'window of appearances' which is a feature of many Egyptian temples. See an example from Nimrud in Moscati (1988: 410).

2. Ug. *gb*. Cf. Heb. √*gbb*, *gēb*, *gōb*, Akk. *gubbu*. Many leave untranslated. Pardee (1993a: 302) translates 'the 'mound'(-room)'. Heb. *gab* has the sense of 'mound' as used in a cultic context in Ezek. 16.24, 31 and 39. Independently, Pardee (1996: 274) explains the ritual use of a large pit in the palace in royal funerals. Following my translation, is this perhaps the same pit? 'The goddess enters' means that the image is taken in. Puech (1993: 329): 'alcove'.

3. Ug. *'šr 'šr*. It is possible to take this as 'ten, ten' (thus de Tarragon 1989: 162). Does this mean 'two rows of ten'? Cf. 'four and four' in KTU 1.41.51. However, this leaves the sentence with no verb. It is therefore tempting to take it as verb and noun: 'serve a banquet', thus Xella (1981: 87), de Moor (1987: 169), del Olmo (1992a: 191) and Pardee (1993a: 302). Ditto, with 'libation': Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín (1975f: 526); Xella accepts this as an alternative. KTU 1.3 i 9 appears to fix the sense precisely. The expression recurs at KTU 1.109.5, 1.119.32-33. See *UT*, 462 §19.1932, (*'šr* II), *WUS*, 244 §2111 (*'šr* i) and *DLU*, 92 (first entry). In discussing KTU 1.48, de Moor (1970a: 310) explains *'šr 'šr* by the obscure signs following (now read by *KTU*^{2} as b gb [Rom.]) as 'DU NU (??)... which could stand for *alāk ṣalmi* (Ugaritic *hlk ṣlm*) "the coming of the statue" '; combining this with his reading of the preceding and following words he translates: 'give the tithe (*'šr*

chapel[5] of the star-gods.

1.43 R 5 Offerings[6]: a robe and a tunic, a *uš pǵ*-garment; gold, three (shekels according to the) commercial (weight)[7]; a ram, an ox and three sheep[8] as communion-sacrifices, seven times to the gods, (and) seven times to Kothar.

1.43 R 10 Subsequently the two Gathru-gods[9] come into the royal chapel[10]. A shekel of gold[11] to Shapsh and Yarih; to Gathru a shekel of refined
silver; a muzzle and a lun[g] to Anat[12]; a shekel of gold

šr) of the Coming of the Statue in the House of the great gods (*bt ilm <rbm>*)'.

4. *KTU*[1] reads b*.(?) (Rasur:xx), *KTU*[2] bgb (Rom.). *CTA* [--]. Pardee (1993a: 301: [*b*.]--[.]).

5. I take it that this is in the palace, rather than a separate temple. The so-called 'Hurrian temple' is a palace chapel. Is this an allusion to it?

6. Damaged text: [[×]] *trmt KTU*[2]. Spronk (1986: 157) reads *z'tr mt*, 'marjoram of death'.

7. Ug. *tlṯt.mzn.drk*. I follow del Olmo (1992a: 191 and n. 98): *drkm* in KTU 4.688.8 are 'traffickers'; the √*drk* ('travel, journey') giving the extended sense of 'commerce'. Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín (1975f: 527) propose correcting to *dkr*, 'male animal' (see l. 19 and cf. Heb. *zākār*), and are followed by Xella (1981: 87, 89) and de Tarragon (1989: 162 and n. 72). De Moor (1987: 169): 'food for a three-day *journey*'. Pardee (1993a: 302): 'a traveler's scale'.

8. Usually ovine victims are distinguished according to sex: *š*, 'ram' or *dqt*, lit. 'small cattle', 'ewe'. The term *ṣin* is generic, as is clear from its two-gender nature in Heb. (*ṣō'n*). The *ṣin* here might be expected to be differentiated from the immediately preceding *š* (l. 9), but there were no doubt other factors (whether the sheep was weaned, the nature of its diet, whether it was horned, castrated, had borne lambs etc.) which determined its appropriateness for specific rituals.

9. Ug. *gtrm*. See Pardee (1993a: 317) for identification of this term. He suggests that it denotes Shapsh, Yarih and a god called Gathru ('Powerful') as a group of chthonian deities. This would accord with the use of a pit at the opening of the text.

10. Ug. *bt mlk*. Either 'palace' or more probably, in view of the cultic context, the chapel royal. The images of the gods are brought in procession. 'Temple of Milku': Levine and de Tarragon (1993: 99).

11. These shekels were presumably to a different standard from those identified as 'commercial' in ll. 5-6. Cf. also the term *ṭb*, 'good' applied to the silver below. A multiple system of weights and measures was no doubt open to abuse. Cf. Amos 8.5.

12. The grouping of the offerings with the appropriate deity is sometimes difficult to identify with precision. Xella (1981: 87) differs here. This problem is

1.43 R 15 to Shap[sh and Ya]rih; to Gathru two [shekels of] refined [silver]; a muzzle and a lung [to Anat]; [ ] temple, an ox and a ram[13].

[ ] to the Gathru-gods.

[ ] to the two (images of) Anat[14].

[Gath]ru-gods two males.

1.43 V 20 [ ] to the two (images of) Anat.

[ ] to *slm*[15].

[Ish]hara he clothes[16],

The king goes to fetch the gods[17].

Behind the gods he shall walk on foot[18]: the king shall walk on foot, seven times with all of them[19].

common to several ritual texts. 'A lung': cf. n. 25 to KTU 1.119.14.

13. Either the entire ritual sequence is duplicated (ll. 10b-13a = 13b-16a) or there is an extended dittography.

14. Text *l'ntm*. Lit. 'two Anats'. More likely two distinct cult-images of the goddess, perhaps from different quarters of the city. Pardee (1993a: 303): 'for 'Anatu also'.

15. De Moor (1987: 171): 'staircase' (cf. Heb. *sullām*). Cf. also Pardee (1993a: 305). Xella (1981: 89) and de Tarragon (1989: 163): 'for Salim' (Shalem: *s* for *š*).

16. Text [ ]*ḫry.ylbš*. Xella (1981: 22, 90, citing KTU 4.168.9-10) proposes [*uš*]*ḫry*. De Moor (1987: 171): 'a Hurrian garment'. De Tarragon (1989: 163) takes the king to be the subject of the verb.

17. Ug. *ilm*. 'Two gods': de Moor (1987: 171). We have seen that the pl. of *il*, *ilm* in the poetic texts, is often *ilhm* in prose. It is therefore possible that *ilm* in prose is du.

18. Ug. *p'nm*. 'Barefoot': de Moor (1987: 171). The king would normally appear in public on a litter, or in shoes designed to keep him from touching the ground when in a state of ritual purity.

19. Is this perhaps a 'beating of the bounds', a sevenfold circumambulation of the palace symbolising possession of the realm? Cf. the sevenfold march round the walls of Jericho.

KTU 1.47, 1.118 and RS 20.24: Pantheon Lists

(KTU 1. 47 = CTA 29 = UT 17 = RS 1.017)
(KTU 1. 118 = RS 24.264 + 24.280)
(RS 20.24)

Select Bibliography
KTU 1.47: Virolleaud 1929: Pl. LXX; de Tarragon 1980: 150-62; Xella 1981: 325-27; Pardee 2000: 291-319.
KTU 1.118: Herdner 1978: 1-3; de Tarragon 1980: 150-62; Xella 1981: 325-27; Pardee 2000: 659-60.
RS 20.24: Nougayrol 1968a; de Tarragon 1980: 150-62; Healey 1985.
All three texts: del Olmo 1992a: 35-65; Wyatt 1998b, 1999b; Pardee as above and 2001a: 9-12.

This appears to be a canonical list: apart from these three examples of the list, it forms the basis of KTU 1.148, a ritual text which reiterates sections of the pantheon list in a series of units. Cf. also the different names appearing in the pantheon lists KTU 1.102, 1.123 and the lists appearing in the ritual texts KTU 1.39, 41 (*qv*.), 87. See also RS 26.142 and 1992.2004. Some recent literature on individual deities listed below. On the pantheon in general see de Moor (1970a) and del Olmo (1992a: 35-65).

	KTU 1.47 Ugaritic	KTU 1.118 Ugaritic	RS 20.24 Akkadian	English
1	*il ṯpn*			The gods of Saphon[1]
	ilib	1 *ilib*	1 DINGIR *abi*	The god of the ancestor[2]

1. On the rationale of this translation (against 'the god Saphon'), see Healey (1985: 117). Saphon appears independently as a deity in l. [15] (parallels 14).

2. See most recently Margalit (1989a: 269), van der Toorn (1993; 1996: 155-60) and Healey (1995a). In the latter passage (1996: 156) van der Toorn notes that the *ilib* of the present pantheon-list may be distinct from that of the Aqhat story, being Ilaba (citing Nougayrol 1968a: 46 n. 2). Against this is the implausibility of a member of the pantheon (especially an otherwise unknown one) apparently taking precedence over El, a problem not faced in the present context if it is ancestral gods in general who have precedence over the organized pantheon. The Akk. of RS 20.24.1 is against the alternative view, though Margalit suspects that this otherwise unparalleled form is a clumsy translation of the Ugaritic.

	il		*il*		*ilum*^{lum}	El[3]
	dgn		*dgn*		^{d}*dagan*	Dagan[4]
5	*b'l ṣpn*		*b'l ṣpn*		^{d}*adad bel ḫuršan ḫazi*	Baal of Saphon
	b'lm	5	*b'lm*	5	^{d}*adad II*	Baal
	b'lm		*b'lm*		^{d}*adad III*	Baal
	b'lm		*b'lm*		^{d}*adad IV*	Baal
	b'lm		*b'lm*		^{d}*adad V*	Baal
10	[*b*]*'lm*		*b'lm*		^{d}*adad VI*	Baal
	[*b'l*]*m*	10	*b'lm*	10	^{d}*adad VII*	Baal
	[*arṣ*] *w šmm*		*arṣ w šmm*		^{d}*idim ù idim*	Earth and Heaven[5]
	[*kṯr*]*t*		*kṯrt*		^{d}*sasuratum*[6]	Kotharat[7]
	[*yrḫ*]		*yrḫ*		^{d}*sîn*	Yarih[8]
15	[*ṣpn*]		*ṣpn*		^{d}*ḫuršan ḫazi*	Saphon[9]
	[*kṯr*]	15	*kṯr*	15	^{d}*ea*	Kothar[10]
	[*pdry*]		*pdry*		^{d}*ḫebat*	Pidray[11]
	[*'ṯtr*]		*'ṯtr*		^{d}*aštabi*	Athtar[12]
	[*ǵrm w 'mqt*]		*ǵrm w* ['*mqt*][13]		^{d}*ḫuršanu*^{M} *u anuutu*[*m*]	Mountains and Valleys[14]
20	[*aṯrt*]		[*a*]*ṯrt*		^{d}*ašratum*	Athirat[15]
	['*nt*]	20	*'nt*	20	^{d}*anatum*	Anat[16]

3. See Herrmann 1995a.
4. See Handy 1992a; Healey 1995b.
5. The Akk. (*šamu u erṣetum*) and Heb. (*šāmayim w*^{e}*ereṣ*) reverse this order. The expression could perhaps be translated 'the Cosmos', since heaven and earth constitute a merismic expression, containing all that lies between the extremities. The *arṣ* has overtones of the underworld, rather than simply 'earth' as the place on which people live. 'Heaven', or in this DN context, 'Sky'. I have preserved 'heavens' in all poetic contexts despite Davies' plea (1995: 123). No one is going to read Christian sentiments into a Canaanite heaven!
6. The form is pl.: Nougayrol (1968a: 63, transliterated as *sasuratum*) and Pardee (1995: col. 916). The form *šassuratu* also appears in Akk. (Becking 1995b: col. 1617). The form *šṯrt* occurs at KTU 1.5 v 3, but seems to have no links with the DN.
7. See Pardee 1995.
8. See Schmidt 1995.
9. See Wyatt 1995a. Invoked as a DN in KTU 1.19 ii 35.
10. See Pardee 1995b.
11. See n. 11 to KTU 1.3 i 23.
12. See most recently, Xella 1996.
13. This can be restored from KTU 1.148.6.
14. See Pardee 1995c, 2000: 296-99.
15. See Wiggins 1993; Wyatt 1995c; Binger 1996.
16. See Walls 1992; P.L. Day 1995.

	[*šp*]*š*		*špš*	^{d} *šamaš*	Shapsh[17]
	[*a*]*rṣy*		*arṣy*	^{d} *allatum*	Arṣiy
	[*u*]*šḫry*		*ušḫry*	^{d} *išḫara*	Ishhara[18]
25	[*'*] *ṯtrt*		*'ṯtrt*	^{d} *ištar^{j}šṯar*	Athtart[19]
	il t'dr b'l[20]	25	*il t'dr b'l*	25 *ilânu^{M} tillat ^{d} adad*	The gods who help Baal[?21]
	ršp		*r*[*š*]*p*	^{d} *nergal*	Reshef[22]
	ddmš		*ddmš*	^{d} *dadmiš*	Dadmish
	pḫr ilm		*pḫr ilm*	^{d}*puḫur ilâni^{M}*	The assembly of the gods
30	*ym*		*ym*	^{d} *tâmtum*	Yam[23]
	uṯ ḫt	30	*uṯ ḫt*	30 $^{d\ DUG}$BUR.ZI.NÍ G.NA	Censer[24]
	knr		*knr*	$^{d\ is}$ *kinarum*	Kinnar (lyre)[25]
	mlkm		*mlkm*	^{d} MA.LIK.MEŠ	Milkom[26]
	šlm		*šlm*	^{d} *salimu*	Shalem[27]

17. See Wiggins 1996.

18. See Becking 1995c.

19. See J. Day 1992a, 1992b; Wyatt 1995d.

20. 'The gods who help Baal'. We would expect these to be Baal's assistants (cf. KTU 1.5 v 8-9).

21. See Nougayrol 1968a: 57. He links the Akk. form with Ninegal and Tešup. Lit. 'the gods who help Baal'. See also del Olmo 1992a: 57; M.S. Smith 1992; Rouillard 1995.

22. See Fulco 1976; Handy 1992b; Xella 1995a.

23. It is significant that the sea-god, usually construed as the principle of Chaos, is, as a god, presumably amenable to influence through the cult. Thus he receives a ram in KTU 1.46.6 and 1.148.9. Not so Mot, who is absent from all ritual texts. Yam is in some respects a Semitic Poseidon, though also cognate with Gk Typhoeus-Typhon (Wyatt 1995a).

24. See Nougayrol 1968a: 58.

25. See Wyatt 1995e. In RS 26.142.6 Nougayrol (1968a: 321) identified $^{il\ is}$ *zannaru* as 'Lyre'. The syllabic text is read as $^{d\ giš}$ZA.MUŠ by del Olmo (1992a: 52 n. 65) and corresponds in turn to Akk. *sammû*. See also Gurney (1968: 229-30, U.7/80 rh ll. [0], 13, 20). Does this perhaps lend some further circumstantial support to my explanation of *ṯtmnt* in n. 155 to KTU 1.15 iii 12?

26. See Puech 1995. See also at KTU 1.161.11 and n. 23.

27. See Huffmon 1995.

KTU 1.65: A Prayer for the Security of Ugarit

(KTU 1. 65 = CTA 30 = UT 53, 107 = RS 4.474)

Select Bibliography

Dhorme 1933; Obermann 1936; Virolleaud 1939; Aistleitner 1955; Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín 1975e; Dietrich and Loretz 1981; Xella 1981: 209-15; del Olmo 1992a: 228-29, 1992d; Aboud 1994: 186-88; Avishur 1994: 308-29; Holloway 1998; Wyatt 1998a: 858-59; Pardee 2000: 364-85, 2001a: 16-18.

A liturgical prayer addressed to the gods, but invoking in particular El (or, problematically, Baal), and seeking divine favour for the protection of the city. Cf. KTU 1.119. The invocation of the divine weapons is particularly interesting (see del Olmo 1992d) in view of the discovery of Mari text A 1968 and its implications for royal ideology and the Baal Cycle. (On this and other material see Durand 1993, Watson and Wyatt 1997 and Wyatt 1998a.)

1.65 R 1 'Gods of[1] the pantheon[2],
family of the gods,
assembly of the gods;
Thuk[!]amun[3] and Shanim,
1.65 R 5 El and Athirat!
Be gracious, El[4]!

1. The translation above takes this to denote a specific group among the gods, *il* being cs. pl. The whole tricolon is an invocation: 'O . . . '. Hence absence of definite article in translation. (Similarly in subsequent lines.) Cf. usage of ll. 2, 3 below, and Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín (1975a: 523: perhaps a determinative use of *il*?) on comparison with KTU 1.40.41, 1.40.42 and reconstructions elsewhere in text. Or possibly 'El, the sons of . . . ' (cf. Avishur 1995: 310). Xella's translation (1981: 210), 'the gods, sons of El', is less satisfactory.

2. Ug. *bn il* is best construed simply as 'the gods' outside mythological contexts. The context requires 'the pantheon' for stylistic reasons.

3. Text: *ṯrmn*. Correct to *ṯkmn*.

4. Ug. *ḫnn il*. Or: 'El is gracious', cf. Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín (1975a: 524) and Avishur (1995: 310, 313). Avishur treats all three qualities in this tricolon as epithets. My translation treats them as hypostases, invoked and functioning almost as imper. verbs. Cf. Obermann (1936: 44) and Aistleitner (1955: 3). 'Be gracious, God!' (addressed to another god, such as Baal) is equally possible, especially given ll. 10-15.

Help,[5] El!
Peace, El!

El, hasten!
El, succour![6]

1.65 R 10 lower edge For the sake of[7] of Saphon,
for the sake of[8] Ugarit!

1.65 V By the divine spear[9];
by the divine axe[10];
by the divine mace[11];

1.65 V 15 by the divine *dṯn*-weapon[12];

5. Ug. *nṣbt*. 'Help': del Olmo (1992a: 228).

6. Ug. *il ḫš il add*. Del Olmo's suggestion, 'the god of divine (Mount) *Ḫš*, *Adadu*' (1992d: 255) gratuitously introduces an otherwise unattested name for the divine mountain. Cf. del Olmo (1992d: 229): 'the god *Ḥaṣu*, the god *Adadu*'. Reading *add* as *hd*(*d*) (reflecting Akk. spelling or pronunciation?). Avishur (1995: 310): 'El, hasten! El, save!', taking *ḫš* as related to Heb. *ḥwš*, *ḥyš*, Akk. *ḫašu*, 'hasten', and *add* as related to Ar. √*'dy*, *'dw*, 'succour' (citing Dhorme 1933: 233). This seems to me to make a better overall sense of the text, though it raises interesting problems on the identity of the god addressed as *il*. Is it El, or Baal, who is credited with the weapons in ll. 12-14?

7. Following Avishur (1995: 310, 315). Text *b'd*. Many correct to *b'l* (e.g. *KTU*[2]). The question is whether the following *b'l* should also be read as *b'd* (as by Avishur, citing Obermann [1936] in support).

8. See previous note. Reading *b'd*, 'on behalf of Ugarit', as by Avishur (1995: 310). Or is this an apostrophe to Baal, 'O Baal of Ugarit', or even one to El, 'O lord of Ugarit'?

9. Ug. *mrḥ*. (Eg. *mrḥ*, Heb. *rōmaḥ*, *UT*, 437-38 §19.1547). Avishur (1995: 310, 316): 'excellence' (citing Ar. *mrḥ*, 'pride, conceit').

10. Ug. *nit*. Identified by Xella (1981: 214) with the bronze or copper weapon *ni-it*, weighing 1 me (100 shekels: the noting of its weight indicates its metallic nature) mentioned in RS 20.235.13 (Nougayrol 1968b: 178-79). The same term is written more fully in RS 19.23.1, 5 and 19.135.2 as *ni-'i-tu qâtê* ^{MES}. See also del Olmo (1992d: 256 n. 13). Avishur (1995: 310, 316): 'praise' (Heb. √*nwy*, *nyh*, Ar. *nwt*).

11. Ug. *ṣmd*. Cf. at KTU 1.2 iv 11 etc.. The √*ṣmd* means 'to bind', and so may mean either an axe or a mace, on which the head is *bound* to the haft. As separate from *nit* in l. 13, I take it to be a mace. Avishur (1995: 310, 316): 'eternity' (Ar. *ṣamada*).

12. Identified as 'a weapon(?)' by Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín (1975d: 524). Xella (1981: 214) notes the √*dṯ*, 'crush, trample' (*WUS*, 83-84 §803). On this basis this is the fourth weapon in a series. It is taken as a form of offering by del Olmo

by the divine burnt-offering;
by the divine perpetual offering[13];
by the divine *ǵdyn*-offering[14];
by the divine...[15]'

(1992a: 229), who considers the text to deal in groups of three. Cf. Heb. *dešen*. Avishur (1995: 310): 'force'.

13. Cf. Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín 1975a: 524; Xella 1981: 214; del Olmo 1992a: 229. Akk. *kinātu*, *kinūtu*.

14. *WUS*, 246 §2134: 'offering at dawn' (Ar. *ǵadāt*, 'early morning'). Occurs as a PN: *UT*, 463 §19.1948, *DLU*: KTU 4.63 i 4). Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín (1975a: 524): 'thing'. Cf. del Olmo (1992a: 229 n. 26).

15. Aistleitner (1955: 91 n. 2): [*i*]*l* [*nd*]*d*. *CTA*: [b]n - -. *KTU*^{2}: [b *ṣ*]d [i]l, now lost (p. 91 n. 2). This list of cultic items on the verso is invoked as evidence of divine concern for the city, functioning almost as minor hypostases.

KTU 1.78: An Astronomical Text

(KTU 1.78 = UT 143, 1162 = RS 12.061)

Select Bibliography

Virolleaud 1950: 25-27, 1957: 189-90; Sawyer and Stephenson 1970; Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín 1974; Xella 1981: 171-73; Jong and van Soldt 1989; Walker 1989; Seitter and Duerbeck 1990; del Olmo 1992a: 235; Pardee and Swerdlow 1993; Pardee 2000: 416-27, 2001a: 130-31.

This text appears to record a total eclipse of the sun at Ugarit. It has been identified as occurring on the following dates: 3 May 1375 (Sawyer and Stephenson; Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín), 5 March 1223 (de Jong and van Soldt). Not an eclipse: Pardee and Swerdlow. To some extent the theory has determined the translation, so alternatives are given.[1]

1. Here is a selection of published translations:

Virolleaud:	During the six days of the new moon of Ḫiyar, the Sun-goddess set, her porter being Reshef. Therefore the servants will kill (or: expel) the intendant (or: governor). (Reading in l. 5: *w'*$^{(?)}$*bdm tbqr*$^{(?)}$*n*.)
Sawyer and Stephenson:	The day of the new moon in the month of Ḫiyar was put to shame. The Sun went down (in the day-time) with Mars in attendance. (This means that) the overlord will be attacked by his vassals.
Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín:	The day of the new moon of the month Ḫiyar was disgraced. The sun went down, Reshef was her porter. The livers have been examined: danger! (Reading in l. 5: *kbdm tbqrn*.)
Xella:	The day of the new moon (of the month) of Ḫiyar was disastrous. The sun (or: Shapsh) set; its (or: her) porter was Reshef. Two livers were examined. Danger!
de Jong and van Soldt:	On the...day of the new moon in (the month of) Ḫiyaru the Sun went down, its gate-keeper was Reshef. Two livers were examined: danger!
Seitter and Duerbeck:	In the quiet (or: sixth hour, or: sixth day) of the day of the new moon of (the month) Hiyar the sun set; her porter was Reshef (Mars). So a liver (or: two livers) was (were) examined: there is danger(?).
Pardee and Swerdlow:	During the six days of the (rituals of) the new moon of (the month of) Ḫiyyāru, the sun set, her gatekeeper (being) Rashap. The men(?) shall seek out the prefect. (Reading for l. 5: [*wa*]*dm*[.]*tbqrn*.)

1.78 R 1-4 At the sixth (hour[2]) of the first day of Hiyyar[3] the sun set, her attendant being Mars[4].

V 5-6 Livers[5] were examined: beware[6]!

An alternative translation:

1.78 R 1-4 The first day of Hiyyar was put to shame[7]: the sun set, her attendant being Mars.

V 5-6 Livers were examined: beware!

2. If (*b*)*ṯṯ* means 'six' (it cannot mean 'sixth' in ordinal usage, which is *ṯdṯ*) rather than shame', it cannot refer to the sixth day if it is a matter of an eclipse. Hence 'hour' supplied as by Seitter and Duerbeck. We have no indication of the numbering of hours in Ug. (or Heb.), but may note that it is possible that the ordinal is not used, while it might be expected to be with days (cf. French: à six heures, au sixième jour).

3. The month Hiyyar (*ḫyr*) fell in April–May according to Olivier (1971, 1972), accepted by Cohen (1993: 378), but revised to February–March by de Jong and van Soldt (1993: 71).

4. Ug. *ršp*. Reshef, identified with Nergal, was the planet Mars. On the dating of Sawyer and Stephenson (1970: 471) the red star Aldebaran was misidentified as the red planet Mars, which would be cause for comment.

5. Various readings proposed: *kbdm* (as above, pl. rather than du. or sg.), 'livers': '*bdm*, 'servants', *adm*: 'men'. A certain reading is impossible.

6. Ug. *skn*. Lit. 'danger!'. As can be seen, this is variously translated. There are two lines of interpretation: (1) *skn*, a political figure (cf. Heb. √*skn* I: *sōkēn*, 'steward'; (2) (followed here) *skn*, √*skn* II: 'incur danger'. The verso (ll. 5-6) must somehow represent an adequate response to the event described in ll. 1-4. It seems that some crisis is involved, which does not seem to be adequately represented in Pardee and Swerdlow's approach. A heliacal setting of Mars hardly seems to constitute a particular crisis. An eclipse does.

7. This is to take *bṯṯ* to relate to √*bwṯ*, 'to shame'. Alternatively: 'was delayed' (as in Exod. 32.1 cited as *bwṯ* polel in BDB; Syr. *būṯ*, Akk. *bāšū*). This would mean that any putative eclipse took place at dawn.

KTU 1.83: A Goddess Confronts a Dragon

(KTU 1.83 = UT 1003 = RS 16.266)

Select Bibliography

Virolleaud 1957: 12; Oldenburg 1969: 198-99; J. Day 1985: 15-16; de Moor 1987: 181-82; de Tarragon 1989: 28-30; Parker 1997: 192-93; Pitard 1998a.

Fragment of text which was originally the right-hand column of a larger composition. Classified as mythological by Virolleaud, but as an incantation by de Moor. It is generally agreed to relate to Anat's confrontation with a dragon. Published translations vary widely, indicating the difficulty of the text. The following attempt is entirely provisional.

1.83 R 1 [ ]
[ ] god[1] [ ]
[It ca]me out[2] of the underworld.
With (its) talons[?3] it turned the sea to foam[4],

1. Or: 'El'.

2. Text [ ]*un*. Usually restored [*ṯṣ*]*un* (√*yṣa*). I take *tnn*, the dragon of l. 8, to be the subject, and accordingly read [*yṣ*]*un*.

3. A guess. Or: 'fangs'? Ug. *mḫnm*. Virolleaud (1957: 12) followed by Oldenburg, Day, de Moor, Gordon (*UT*, 432 §19.1455) and Aistleitner (*WUS*, 181 §1545) took this to be the biblical toponym Mahanaim. Rejected by Caquot (1989: 29 n. 41), who tentatively suggests a link with Ar. *maḫana*, 'draw water'. I have construed it as follows: It seems to me that it is part of the dragon's body (cf. the tongues and tail of the following cola); Heb. √*ḥnh* gives *ḥᵃnît*, 'spear head', used in Ps. 57.5 as a metaphor for the teeth of a lion. A possible link? Another approach is to note Ug. √*ḫnn*, which appears in KTU 2.15.9-10 in the expression *anḫnnn w iḫd*, 'I shall ...it/him and shall seize (it/him)'. This suggests an act of some kind of violence. Perhaps a D stem (*m-* pt. prefix). Cf. Heb. *ḥānan* II, 'be loathsome'? (But the Heb. pi. takes dat.: Job 19.17.)

4. Ug. *'rp*? Thus *KTU*^{2}; n. 1: 'read *ṯrp*?'. Cf. l. 6. While the doubt cannot be entirely settled, I am inclined to read *'rp* and *t'rp* in ll. 4 and 6 respectively. Note J. Day (1985: 15 n. 36). See also Virolleaud (1957: 12 §3) for transcription. Day translates 'swirled (?)'; 'caused to spurt': Caquot (1989: 29), both taking the sense as I do from Heb. *'rp* II, 'to drip', from which the n. *'ārîp* 'cloud' is derived. Cf. also Ug. *'rpt*, perhaps Heb. *ʿᵃrābôt* 'clouds' in Ps. 68.5, though this is often corrected (see *BHS* app.). 'Break the neck': de Moor (1987: 182 reading *'rp*; *t'rp*, de Moor and Spronk 1987: 74). For this sense cf. Heb. √*'rp* I, denom. vb., 'break the neck'. But if the dragon is an aspect of the sea, the opposition between the dragon

1.83 R 5 with its tongues it licked the sky,
with its tails[5] it turned the sea to foam[6].
She set the dragon[7] up on high[8],
1.83 R 10 she bound it in the heights of Lebanon[9].
...[10]

and the sea implicit in this translation is unlikely.

5. All three terms, *mḫnm*, *lšnm*, *ḏnbtm* ('talons... tongues... tails') end with *m*. I have taken this to be the adv. *m* of instrumental use (X*m* = with an X). 'Tongues' I have taken as pl. with adv. *m*, since the dragon is conventionally represented as having seven heads (and therefore seven tongues). Whatever *mḫn*(*m*) means, it is presumably du. or pl. The tails could be du., and construed as the subj. of the preceding vb *ṯṯrp*.

6. It would be tempting to distinguish the vbs in the cola of ll. 4 and 6, but there is no compelling reason to do so.

7. Text *tnn*, not *tan*. Cf. *KTU*^{2}.

8. Ug. *lšbm*. Not 'muzzle' but 'set on high'. See n. 48 at KTU 1.3 iii 40.

9. Text *lbnn*, rather than *lbnt* of *KTU*^{2}. This would indicate a different recension altogether of the dragon-slaying, since in the Baal cycle the entire tradition is set on Mt Saphon (Wyatt 1995a; 1996b: 34-44). Is the dragon finally placed somewhere on Mt Lebanon itself? This would make an interesting comparison with the gist of my argument in Wyatt (1995a), in which I opined that Mt Saphon was itself the corpse of Yam. Another possibility is to see this as an intermediate stage in the proceedings (the narrative does not end at this point), and to conjecture that the goddess subsequently set the dragon among the stars, the final destination of so many assorted characters in Gk tradition, perhaps as the prototype of the constellation Draco. Perhaps it should be noted in favour of this proposal that the only other prepositional form with *mṛym* is *bmṛym* in KTU 1.3 iv 1, which suggests that the present *lmṛym* has some other sense, such as 'above the heights of...'.

10. No certain sense can be gleaned from the increasingly fragmentary ll. 11-13. Cf. de Moor (1987: 182) with Caquot (1989: 30). An important new study by Pitard completed after this volume went to press (1998a: my thanks to Wayne Pitard for sending me a copy and allowing me to cite this) offers some modifications to the understanding of the beginning of the text, and now achieves a reading for the last lines. This translation of these reads as follows:

> Toward the desert (or: Dried up) Shall you be Scattered, O Yamm!
> To the multitudes of Ḫt, O Nahar!
> You shall not see (or: Indeed you shall) see;
> lo! you shall be parched! (or: lo! you shall foam up!)

KTU 1.92: The Myth of Athtart the Huntress

(KTU 1.92 = UT 2001 = RS 19.039 + 174[12] + 174[51])

Select Bibliography
Virolleaud 1965: 3-5; Herrmann 1969; de Moor 1985a; Margalit 1989b; de Tarragon 1989: 31-36; Dijkstra 1994.

A mythological fragment. It seems that when Athtart returns from a hunting expedition, Baal attempts to seduce her. Dijkstra has identified further fragments to augment this text. The goddess Athtart remains elusive at Ugarit, appearing generally in association with Anat. This is the only mythological text so far discovered in which she appears independently. The Eg. myth of Astarte and the tribute of the sea (Ritner 1997) offers tantalizing parallels to the events associated with Anat in KTU 1.3 iii 38–iv 3 (especially iii 39-42), and if witnessing a West Semitic tradition suggests that the two goddesses are conceptualized in very similar ways. This may partly explain why the two goddesses appear to undergo a form of syncrasia, emerging in the latter part of the first millennium as Atargatis (the 'Dea Syria' of Lucian's work).

1.92 R 1 Belonging to Thabil[1].
Athtart [went out] to hunt[2],
she went out into the wilderness[3] [ ]

1. The owner, rather than the writer, of the tablet. Evidently a 'personal scripture'.

2. The hazards of restoring missing text are evident from the different suggestions for filling this lacuna: [*t ilm*], 'of the gods': Herrmann (1969: 7-8) and Caquot (1989: 32); [*t tṣdn bšdm*], 'scoured the fields': de Moor (1985: 225); *ṣwd* [*tṣd*], '[went a-]hunting': Margalit (1989b: 71, 75); [*tṣdn ayl*], 'went hunting for a deer': Dijkstra (1994: 116). There is room only for at most four signs. No allowance may be made for script on the edge (as on the reverse) since it is entirely missing, and therefore conjectural. Dijkstra's drawing (p. 114) overestimates the amount of available space to the right of the break. I follow Margalit's suggestion.

3. Ug. *mdbr*. Normally 'desert'. 'Steppe': Herrmann (1969: 8); Caquot (1989: 33); 'grazing-land': Margalit (1989b: 71). But this is rather *šd* (Heb. *sadê*), high grass and scrubland. 'Desert' of course is a relative term, the more arid zone of the steppe. Here it is evidently adjacent to an oasis. Cf. Margalit (1989a: 75), who notes the parallel *šd, mdbr* at KTU 1.14 ii 50–iii 1, iv 29-31. There is no need to follow him in identifying the marsh of the present text with Shamak (cf. Sema-

[[4]... were renewed[5]
and the cres[cent moon[6]]
1.92 R 5 And the [lower[?]] deep[7] poured out[8] upon [ ]
[ ] came out of its swamp[9] [ ]
She[10] desired[11] [ ];
her spear against the noble [beast[?]].
Athtart remained[12] in the swamp;
[on her right[?13]] she placed...
1.92 R 10 on her left...[14]

chonitis = Hule) of KTU 1.10 ii 9. Cf. however 'Thamaq' of KTU 1.22 i 8 (though this appears to be a PN), and the location of the raw materials for the bow in KTU 1.17 vi 23 and n. 106.

4. Dijkstra (1994: 116), suggests 'the stars' ([*kbkbm*]), but it would not fit.

5. 'She polished': Margalit (1989b: 70-71, 75-76), restoring [šbr mrḥ] before it: '[the tip of her spear] she polished'. Margalit's extensive reconstruction, based on prosodic and alliterative principles, is too confident.

6. Text: *hl* [*l*]. Or perhaps El[lil]? Cf. n. 6 to KTU 1.24.6. The moon would make a good parallel to the stars proposed in the previous colon (n. 4); Enlil-Ellil—the Mesopotamian storm-god—would make a good parallel to the idea of waters pouring down in the following colon. Certainty is impossible.

7. There were two deeps (*thmtm*): one beneath the earth, the other above the firmament. Cf. Gen. 1.7.

8. Ug. *tglṯ*, cf. Heb. *glš*, 'seethe' (Tuell 1993; Dijkstra 1994: 118). Cf. Herrmann (1969: 5). De Moor (1986): 'snow' (cf. del Olmo 1981a: 532 and refs.), of the upper deep. 'Boiled up': Margalit (1989b: 71), of the lower deep. Since the location for the events of the narrative is a marsh, I take it that the latter option is preferable: the marsh would be the result of ill-draining springs rather than heavy rainfall.

9. Or: 'its lair'? Ug. *ġl*, cf. Ar. *ġîl*, 'swamp, thicket'. On the construction see Dijkstra (1994: 118).

10. Or: '[Athtart] desired': Dijkstra (1994: 117)? Or: 'her spear' (*mḫrḥ*) as subject of the vb? The n. is f. Any reconstruction of the syntax is provisional.

11. Reading *thmd*. Margalit (1989b: 70), reads a word-divider: *thm* (.) *d*[ ], appealing to Virolleaud (1968, 3: *thm b*[ ]) and *KTU*[1]. Both leave a space. *KTU*[2] runs the letters together. Consequently Margalit renders 'the *swamp/zone* wherein [buffalo graze]' (*thm*(.) *d* [r'y.rumm]).

12. Or: 'sat' (Ug. *ṯṯb*), presumably to hide from her quarry.

13. Restoration suggested by de Moor (1985a: 9; also Dijkstra 1994: 117). *Ymn* || *šmal* is a standard word-pair (*RSP*, I 206 §ii 240).

14. The terms untranslated in these cola are *qrẓ* and *trbḫ*. De Moor suggests that these are the names of Athtart's hunting dogs ('Gnawer', Syr. *qrṭ*, and 'Barker', √*nbḫ* > *nbḥ*). Dijkstra proposes 'Mosquito', 'Locust', the smaller fauna of the

She lifted up her eyes and [looked]:
a hind she espied[15],
a bull she sa[w[16]] in the po[o]l.

Her spear she sei[zed in her hand],
her lance[17] in her right hand.

She threw [the spear] at the bull;
she brought down[18] the drinking animal[19].

[She return]ed to [her] house[?20].

1.92 R 15 The Bull her father, El, she gave to ea[t]

[and she] fe[d (him)][21];

she fed Yarih,
[his] gullet [ ].

region: (1994: 119). Margalit (1989b: 71) renders '*acacia*-shrubs...ARBḪ-bushes', citing Ar. *qaraẓ*, Syr. *qeraṭa*, 'acacia' (specifically *prosopis farcta*), and interpreting *arbḥ* (*sic*) by analogy. On this approach, Athtart appears to construct a hide.

15. See Dietrich and Loretz (1968: 309) and de Moor (1985a: 227). Contrast Margalit (1989b: 79). The apparent parallel 'hind', 'bull' constitutes a curious word-pair. See next note.

16. Ug. *ṯr.ʾn*[. De Moor reads 'the gaze of her eye [a gazelle...]', adducing a √*ṯwr* on the evidence of KTU 1.3 v 13 (!) and Heb. *šwr* II. While conjectural, this avoids the awkward word-pair 'hind || bull'. Margalit's reading (1989b: 79: with an appeal to *KTU*[1]) is frustrated by *KTU*[2].

17. Ug. *šbr*: 'lance': Margalit (1989b: 71, 75), citing Akk. *šibirru*, 'stick, staff'. Cf. Caquot (1989: 34 n. 62). De Moor (1985: 227), cites his earlier article (1979: 645).

18. Ug. *tšpl*: tentative reading. See de Moor (1985a: 227): √*špl* D or √*npl* Š.

19. Reading *bʿl ʿbd*[ ], 'the drinking one'. The final *b* could be *d* (Virolleaud, 1965: 3; *KTU*[1]). Margalit (1989b: 71, 80), reading *tšpl.bʿl.ʿbd* [il], 'she felled Baal, [El's] servant', interprets this in the manner in which KTU 1.96 was understood before del Olmo's study (1992c), as an act of omophagy. Thus Athtart kills Baal (in the form of a bull) and feeds him (raw!?) to the other gods. Cf. KTU 1.6 v 19-25, vi 10-11. But in view of the verso of the tablet (not treated by Margalit in his article), which appears to describe Baal's attempt to seduce Athtart, this is improbable.

20. The sequel in l. 14 of the tablet, [*tṯ*]*b.lbt*[*ḥ*], Dijkstra (1994: 115), followed by *KTU*[2], corresponds to a further fragment, RS 19.174 [12], which Dijkstra tentatively suggests belongs at this point.

21. Dijkstra (1994: 117), *KTU*[2], add [*wṯ*]*šlḥ*[*m*], 'and she fed (him)', again based on RS 19.174 [12]. Cf. Jacob (*alias* Esau) feeding his father in Gen. 27, and Kothar's exhortation to Aqhat to offer sacrificial gifts from his hunt (KTU 1.17 v 37-39).

Ko[thar the cra]ftsman.
Hasis [ ]
...Athtart

(Ll. 19-22 missing)

1.92 V 23 [ ] the guardian of the vineyard
[ ] her father, the vineyard...
1.92 V 25 [ ] a shift[22] of linen,
[ ] an aegis[23] of cypress[24]...
Her [ ] wore the splendour of the stars,
magnificence like the stars[25].
When the Virgin[26] had changed,
Baal desired her;
1.92 V 30 the Mighty One[27] would possess her beauty.
Valiant Baal wished to go down to her[28],
he...[29] [ ] the...[30]

22. Cf. de Moor's suggestion (1985a: 229): 'veil'—√*ḥtr*, 'to make a hole'. Dijkstra (1994, 117): 'chemise'.

23. Ug. *ušpġt*: de Moor (1970b: 311; 1985a: 229), takes it to be 'a piece of mail'. The aegis was originally a protective garment. On its Near Eastern origins see West (1995: 139-42). His findings would lead us to expect a feathered garment.

24. Ug. *tišr* is cypress wood (de Moor 1985a: 229 and refs.).

25. Ug. *kbkbm...kbkbt*: lit. 'male stars...female stars'. Stars frequently represent gods and goddesses. Is the expression a periphrasis for 'divine splendour...divine magnificence'?

26. Ug. *btlt*. The form [ ]*tlt* appears on the new fragment RS 19.174 [51] (Dijkstra 1994: 114; *KTU*[2]). The epithet is given elsewhere most frequently to Anat, with whom Athtart has a close relationship. See n. 7 to KTU 1.3 i 15. See however the occurrence at KTU 1.15 ii 27 (and n. 149 *ad loc.*) where most scholars restore '*nt* in the gap, but I argue that it is *rḥmy*, *alter ego* of Athirat. Cf. the ideological dimensions of the terms *ġlmt* (n. 99 to KTU 1.2 i 13) and *mṯt* (n. 167 to KTU 1.15 iv [3]).

27. Ug. *dmrn*. Cf. n. 161 to KTU 1.4 vii 39.

28. Does this mean 'he would enter her'? Hardly de Moor's (1985a: 228) 'into the earth'.

29. Ug. *šmʿ*[: **šmʿ*['], 'he heard': de Moor (1985a: 228); **šm*[*ḥ*] [*sic*: read *ḫ*], 'joyful': Caquot (1989: 35); 'was pleased': Dijkstra (1994: 121).

30. Ug. [ ] *rgbt*. 'she was afraid', de Moor (1985a: 228); Dijkstra (1994: 121 [Ar. *raǧaba*]); 'Lumps of earth' (Heb. *regeb*), Caquot (1989: 35).

...
...
...[the gu]ardian [ans]wered him[?]:
'The city is guarded [against] your [fle]sh[?][31]
Do not give us [ ].'

1.92 V 35 ...
...[32]
[the Chariot]eer of the Clouds,
[wi]ne and portions of fish,
[ ]for Valiant Baal,
[ ]for the Charioteer of the Clouds.

31. Sc. Baal's penis: cf. KTU 1.24.9 and n. 11 *ad loc.* 'The city' is perhaps a metaphor for Athtart's chastity, as may be that of the vineyard, its guardian being her legal protector.

32. L. 36 reads: [ ]'*lthwyn* (no word-dividers). Read as [*b*]'*lth wyn*, 'his lady and wine', by Herrmann (1969: 9) and de Moor (1985a: 228); as [ ]'*lth wyn*..., 'at the time of his going up, and he...', by Caquot (1989: 35); as [*p npš npš*] *b'l thwyn*, '[if the desire] of Baal graves [*sic*: read craves] for [a living being]' by Dijkstra (1994: 118).

KTU 1.96: A Spell against the Evil Eye

(KTU 1.96 = RS 22.225)

Select Bibliography

Virolleaud 1960; Astour 1963, 1967: 180-81, 1988; Lipiński 1965; de Moor 1979: 647-48, 1987: 109-10; de Tarragon 1989: 40-44; Walls 1992: 210-15; del Olmo 1992a: 255-59, 1992c; Lloyd 1994: 288-300; Lewis 1996b; M.S. Smith in Parker 1997: 224-28; Ford 1998, 2000.

After adventurous but misdirected early interpretations, based on the supposition that the initial *'nn* is an error for *'nt*, 'Anat', the understanding of this text has been put on the right track by the studies of del Olmo. (See first note.) The verso of this tablet is in Akkadian (bibliography in *TEO*: 284, 455; *KTU*^{2}, 111). For a spell against eye-diseases see RS 20.06 (Nougayrol 1968a: 64-65). Marvin Pope had intended before his untimely death to champion the old reading *'nt*[1] in l. 1, with a consequent reappraisal of the new line taken here.

1.96 R 1 The Evil Eye[1] roves about,
and disfigures[2] the beauty of its brother[3]

1. Ug. *'nn*. All earlier interpreters corrected text to *'nt* (cf. *KTU*^{1}, contrast *KTU*^{2}), on the supposition that the text treated Anat's ritual consumption, gastronomic or sexual, of Baal. 'Evil eye': del Olmo (1992a: 9). Del Olmo's study rendered all previous discussion obsolete. Marvin Pope's new position (above) was that the two final strokes of the *n* are overwritten across the word-divider (that is subsequent to it), and therefore constitute a correction. He argued that we should accept the original text (sc. *'nt*) in preference to the correction (*'nn*). I would, assuming the premisses for the sake of argument, argue the reverse, that the corrected text is what the scribe considered to be the correct text. It seems that the controversy will continue. (My thanks to Marvin Pope for discussing this with me.)

2. Ug. *šnwt*: √*šny/w*, 'change', Heb. *šānâ* I. For the pejorative nuance see Lloyd (1994: 289 n. 106). Wilfred Watson draws my attention to Eg. *šnt*, 'spell, conjuration', *šni*, 'exorcise' (derived no doubt from *šni*, 'surround'). See Faulkner (1972: 268). But the sense of the present passage is negative.

3. This is the other eye of the pair: earlier interpreters took it to refer to Baal. It is odd that *'nn*, f., should have a 'brother', but perhaps this is in the nature of the complementarity of two eyes (sc. 'brother and sister'), rather than a weakness in del Olmo's approach, as suggested to me by Marvin Pope. Note that the vbs of which *'nn* is subj. are in f. (*hlkt*, *šnwt*, *tspi*, *tšt*), while the 'brother-eye's' vb is m. (*ysmsm*).

and the grace of its brother,

even though (the other eye be) in perfect health[4].

It eats (the other's) flesh without a knife,

1.96 R 5 it drinks (the other's) blood without a cup[5].

The eye of the wicked man[6],
the eye of the wicked woman,
they[7] approach[8].

They approach the eye of the tax collector[9],
the eye of the potter[10],
the eye of the gatekeeper.

May the eye of the gatekeeper return to[11] the gatekeeper;

4. Lit. 'be very beautiful'.

5. There is no warrant for ideas of omophagia here (e.g. Astour 1963; 1967: 180-81; 1988), nor for sexual nuances (Lipiński 1965). The point of the metaphor is rather that a lack of table manners is socially destructive (Lévi-Strauss!). The evil eye affects its healthy partner, and finally destroys it.

6. Del Olmo compares the expression *'n bṯy/t* with Sum. igi lù níg.ḫul dím.ma, Akk. *inu lemuttu*, 'eye of the evil man' (cf. Thomsen 1992).

7. 'They' in ll. 5, 7, du.: the evil eye (one each) of the wicked man and woman.

8. Ug. *tpnn*, D 3 du. In the Akk. spell cited by Thomsen (1993: 23) (TCL 16, 89: 3-12 [A] = BL 3, 3-9 [B]), the eye 'approached' (*ba-te*) various victims. Virolleaud (1960), followed by Caquot (1989: 43 and n. 95), construed as √*pny* (Heb. *pānâ*), 'to approach'. Alternatively, 'bring confusion'. For this approach cf. 'distort': del Olmo (1992a: 9, 11); 'corrupts': Lloyd (1994: 290, 291 n. 113). They cite Ar. *fanna*, 'deceive, confuse, *fannana*, 'diversify, confuse'. Cf. Heb. *pānâ* piel? Confusion represents chaos, as in the Babel story. Others cite Heb. *pānâ* qal (e.g. Caquot 1989: 43 n. 95).

9. Evidently taxation was already the bane of civilized life.

10. 'Tax collector...potter': Ug. *mḫr*, *pḫr*. Individual victims of the effect of the evil eye are required, rather than the collectives ('meeting...assembly') proposed by Lloyd (1994: 291). Del Olmo (1992c) explains the terms thus: Akk. *maḫaru*, 'tax collector', Akk. *paḫāru*, 'potter' (cf. de Moor 1979: 648). If the skilled eyes of these important representatives of society (fiscal, technological, military) are confused, a serious threat will arise for the city. Note the assonance *mḫr*, *pḫr*, and *ṯġr*.

11. 'Return to' (√*ṯwb*) on the understanding that the text constitutes a spell to undo the influence of the evil eye. Or perhaps, on the understanding that it is a spell to render the evil eye inefficacious in the first place, 'remain with' (√*yṯb*). Cf. Heb. *yāšab* with *l* (BDB, 442b), and so on throughout the tricolon. The translation 'return to' (√*ṯb*) would remain the first choice in the final bicolon, as it implies that the evil will redound on the wicked person.

1.96 R 10 may the eye of the potter return to the potter;
may the eye of the tax collector return to the tax collector.
May the eye of the wicked man return to the wicked man;
may the eye of [the wicked woman] ret[urn] to the wicked woman.
...[12]

12. Since the bottom of the recto is missing, we may suppose that there was more to the spell.

KTU 1.100: The Myth of Shapsh and the Mare: A Spell against Snakebite

(KTU 1.100 = RS 24.244)

Select Bibliography

Virolleaud 1968, 564-74; Astour 1968: 13-28; Caquot 1969: 241-54; de Tarragon 1989: 79-94; Lipiński 1974; Dietrich and Loretz 1980; Gaster 1975; Young 1977, 1979; Johnstone 1978: 113-15; Pardee 1978a, 1988a: 193-226; Tsevat 1979; Bowman and Coote 1980; Xella 1981: 224-40; Kottsieper 1984; de Moor 1987: 146-56, 1988; Levine and de Tarragon 1988; del Olmo 1992a: 241-49; Belmonte 1993; Greaves 1994; West 1995: 106-12; Parker 1997: 219-23; Pardee 1997c: 295-98, 2001a: 166-76.

This text, dealing with a rite to cure snakebite, is in the form of a myth of a mare whose foal has been bitten. She appeals in turn to eleven deities or pairs, only finally addressing a twelfth, Horon, the chthonian god who has the power to deal with the problem. Wilfred Watson has drawn my attention to the parallel between this general appeal, coming at last to the only one who can help, and the episode of Shataqat in KTU 1.16 v 10–vi 14, though there is no reason to think that Horon is created after the other deities' failure to act. There are further parallels: Marduk in *Enuma Elish* ii and Durgā in the Purāṇas (see O'Flaherty [1975: 238-49, 333-34] for texts and references). Cf. Enlil as son of twenty-one divine couples (Gallagher 1994: 142). Note the association of horse and snake in Gen. 49.17.

1.100 R 1 The mother of the stallion, Mare[1],
(A) daughter of spring,[2] daughter of stone,
daughter of heaven and the deep[3]

1. A mare-goddess? So Levine and de Tarragon (1988: 494) (but not Gaster [1975: 35], to whom they appeal). On the links between horse-goddesses and the sun see West (1995: 106-13).

2. Is the spring perhaps to be equated with *thm*, the cosmic deep, and the rock with the cosmic mountain, Saphon? Cf. Levine and de Tarragon (1988: 494).

3. A grandiloquent way ('this baroque assemblage of titles': Pardee 1988a: 204) of saying that the horse is wild. The horse featured in the iconography of Athtart (Leclant 1960) and of the sun (cf. 2 Kgs 23.11).

called to Shapsh her mother[4]:

[B I] 'Shapsh, (my) mother, carry my voice
to El at the source of the rivers[5],
at the confluence[6] of the two deeps.

A spell against the bite of a snake,
1.100 R 5 against the venom[7] of a snake that has sloughed[8].

From it[9], let the conjurer[10] destroy,
from it[11] let him cast out the poison.

4. Presumably Shapsh was regarded as the protectress of horses.

5. Ug. *nhrm*. Four rivers, as in Gen. 2.10-14, and not two, as in Dietrich and Loretz (1980a: 154), Xella (1981: 227), de Moor (1987: 147), Levine and de Tarragon (1988: 490) and del Olmo (1992a: 242).

6. Ug. *'dt*. The expression in the Baal Cycle is *qrb apq thmtm*, 'the midst of the springs of the two deeps' (KTU 1.4 iv 22 and restored parallels). The two formulae express the same idea.

7. Levine and de Tarragon (1988: 490), take this as an epithet in the previous colon.

8. De Moor (1987: 147), translates '(My incantation is:) a poisonous serpent has bitten, a serpent which has sloughed its skin'. This is to take *nṯk* and *'qšr* as verbs, and to group the words: *nṯk nḥš šmrr || nḥš 'qšr*. Others (e.g. Pardee [1988a: 203]) group thus: *nṯk nḥš || šmrr nḥš 'qšr* and take the words cited as nouns. Ug. *'qšr*: 'having sloughed (its skin)': thus Bordreuil (1983) and Caquot (1989: 83), with ref. to Ar. *'aqšar*, 'stripped of its skin', explaining the shift *' > '* on the basis of euphony caused by the proximity of an emphatic consonant (sc. the *q*). 'Scaly' (Ar. *qišrat*): Astour (1968: 17) and Pardee (1978a: *passim*). 'Twisting': Xella (1981: 227).

9. Ug. *lnh*. I.e. the snake (Astour [1968: 18]). Alternatively, the victim of snakebite. Similarly in the following colon.

10. Ug. *mlḫš*: (√*lḫš*, Heb. *m^{e}laḥēš*, Ps 58.6: perhaps 'whistle, hiss', copying the sound of a snake?; cf. Astour 1968: 17). Presumably each god invoked is presumed to act the role of conjurer (both 'magician' and 'one who invokes'). Note too the assonantal wordplay between *mlḫš* and *yšlḥm*, 'send away', in l. 6. The enclitic *m* of the latter is consistently used to emphasise the wordplay, an inherent feature of magical formulaic usage. I have taken the clause to be 3 p. sg. ('let the conjurer...'). A voc. sense is attractive (thus Pardee 1978a: 77; 1988a: 203, 209; Xella 1981: 227), but requires that the final tricolon (this has a quasi-poetic structure) be in the indic., where I have taken it to be juss. (with Dietrich and Loretz 1980a: 155, and de Moor 1987: 147; cf. del Olmo 1992a: 243).

11. Ug. *lnh*: Caquot (1989: 89): 'on him', he being the conjurer, victim of the poison.

Then let him bind[12] the snake,
let him dismiss[13] <the snake> that has sloughed,
let him draw up a chair and sit down.'[14]

[B II] She called to Shapsh her mother:

'Shapsh, (my) mother, carry my voice
to Baal in the heights of Saphon.

1.100 R 10 A spell against the bite of a snake,
against the venom of a snake that has sloughed.

From it, let the conjurer destroy,
from it let him cast out the poison.

Then let him bind the snake,
let him send away the snake that has sloughed,
let him dr<aw> up a chair and sit down.'

[B III] She called to Shapsh her mo<ther>:

'Shapsh, (my) mother, carry my voice
1.100 R 15 to Dagan in[15] Tuttul.

A spell against the bite of a snake,
against the venom of a snake that has sloughed.

From it, let the conjurer destroy,
from it let him cast out the poison.

Then let him bind the snake,

12. Taking the three verbs following to be jussives. Thus Dietrich and Loretz (1980a: 154), Caquot (1989: 84-85) and de Moor (1987: 147). They may alternatively be taken as indics.: thus Pardee 1978a: 75; 1988a: 203. Is the binding a metaphor for control with the spell (spellbinding), rather than a literal tying up? Thus Astour 1968: 18.

13. Following the view of Bowman and Coote (1980: 136), rather than 'give to eat' (Š of √*lḥm*) as proposed by most translators. See n. 10: feeding the snake would seem to serve no purpose (contrast Astour [1968: 19], who notes Virolleaud's suggestion [1968: 569] of 'give to drink'—**yšq* for *yṯq*—in l. 6). Sending it packing, especially with a vb that echoes the 'conjurer's' role (n. 10), would perhaps also take away the effects of the poison.

14. Caquot (1989: 85) (and in subsequent strophes) understands the final line thus: '(But the deity) draws up a chair and sits down' sc. refusing to respond to the mare's plea. This is also an acceptable interpretation.

15. Locative sense of *-h*: Astour (1968: 19). Similarly in following strophes.

let him send away the snake that has sloughed,
let him draw up a chair and sit down.'

[B IV] She called to Shapsh her mother:

'Shapsh, (my) mother, carry my voice
1.100 R 20 to Anat and Athtart in Inbub.

A spell against the bite of a snake,
against the venom of a snake that has sloughed.

From it, let the conjurer destroy,
from it let him cast out the poison.

Then let him bind the snake,
let him send away the snake that has sloughed,
let him draw up a chair and sit down.'

1.100 R 25 She called to Shapsh her mother:

[B V] 'Shapsh, (my) [mother], carry my [voice]
to Yarih in Larugat[16].

A spell against the bite of a s[nak]e,
against the venom of a snake that has sloughed.

From it, let the conjurer destroy,
from it let him cast out the poison.

Then let him bind the snake,
let him send away the snake that has sloughed,
let him draw up a chair and sit down.'

1.100 R 30 She called to Shapsh her mother:
[B VI]

'Shapsh, (my) mother, ca<rry> my voice
to Reshef in Bibati[17].

A spell against the bite of a snake,
against the venom of a snake that has sloughed.

16. *DLU*, 248. Lambert (1984: 43) and de Moor (1987: 149 n. 11) suggest that this is a city mentioned in the Ebla tablets.

17. Ug. *bbth*. The residence of Reshef, perhaps a city called Bibati (Barré 1978: 467 n. 32; cit. de Moor 1987: 149 n. 12) rather than 'his temple'. Cf. Astour (1968: 20). Levine and de Tarragon (1988: 497) detect it as a TN in KTU 1.171.3 (= RIH 78.16.3).

From it, let the conjurer destroy,
from it let him cast out the poison.

Then let him bind the snake,
let him send away the snake that has sloug<hed>,
let him draw up a chair and sit down.'

1.100 R 34 [B VII] <She called to Shapsh her mother:

'Shapsh, (my) mother, carry my voice
to Athtart in Mari[18].

A spell against the bite of a snake,
against the venom of a snake that has sloughed.

From it, let the conjurer destroy,
from it let him cast out the poison.

Then let him bind the snake,
let him send away the snake that has sloughed,
34e let him draw up a chair and sit down.'>[19]

1.100 R 35 [B VIII] She called to Shapsh her mother:

'Shapsh, (my) mother, carry my voice
to Zizzu and Kemosh[20] in Huriyat[21].

A spell against the bite of a snake,
against the venom of a snake that has sloughed.

From it, let the conjurer destroy,
from it let him cast out the poison.

Then let him bind the snake,
let him send away the snake that has sloughed,
let him draw up a chair and sit down.'

1.100 R 40 She called to Shapsh her mother:

18. Ug. *'ttrt* here represents the goddess Ishtar. KTU 1.107.41 would lead us to expect Athtar (and Athtapar) here.

19. This section is omitted from the text, but a note on the edge reads: 'after Reshef: Athtart—"to Athtart in Mari, a spell against the bite of a snake"'. See at end of text, following l. 76.

20. See Astour 1966: 278; 1968: 20.

21. Cf. Astour 1968: 20.

[B IX] 'Shapsh, (my) mother, carry my voice
to Milk[22] in Athtarat[23].

A spell against the bite of a snake,
against the venom of a snake that has sloughed.
From it, let the conjurer destroy,
from it let him cast out the poison.

Then let him bind the snake,
1.100 V let him send away the snake that has sloughed,
let him draw up a chair and sit down.'

1.100 V 45 (B X) She called to Shapsh her mother:

'Shapsh, (my) mother, carry my voice
to Kothar-and-Hasis in Crete.

A spell against the bite of a snake,
against the venom of a snake that has sloughed.

From it, let the conjurer destroy,
from it let him cast out the poison.

Then let him bind the snake,
let him send away the snake that has sloughed,
1.100 V 50 let him draw up a chair and sit down.'

1.100 R 45 [B XI] She called to Shapsh her mother:

'Shapsh, (my) mother, carry my voice
to Shahar and Shalem in heaven[24].

A spell against the bite of a snake,
against the venom of a snake that has sloughed.

From it, let the conjurer destroy,
from it let him cast out the poison.

1.100 V 55 Then let him bind the snake,
let him send away the snake that has sloughed,

22. The DN is also vocalized Malik(u), and is probably related to Molek and Milkom.

23. City in the Hauran (Bashan). See n. 8 to KTU 1.108.2.

24. Ug. *šmm*. We would expect a TN, but none corresponds to this. Shalem was patron deity of Jerusalem ('Salem' in Gen. 14) but this would require textual emendation.

let him draw up a chair and sit down.'

[B XII] She called to Shapsh her mother:

'Shapsh, (my) mother, carry my voice
to Horon[25] in the fortress[26].
A spell against the bite of a snake,
against the venom of a snake that has sloughed.

From it, let the conjurer destroy[27],
1.100 V 60 from it let him cast out the poison.

60a <Then let him bind the snake,
let him send away the snake that has sloughed,
let him draw up a chair and sit down.>'[28]

(C I) Towards Horon she turned[29] her face
for she was about to be deprived[30] of her offspring[31].

He went to[32] the eastern city[33].

25. Horon, a powerful god in the context of exorcism (here, in KTU 1.107, KTU 1.124.6 and KTU 1.169) is conspicuous by his absence from the pantheon list of KTU 1.47 and parallels. The apparent anomaly of an important omission from a canonical text warns us against drawing too-far-reaching conclusions from the partial evidence before us. Neither mythological texts, nor ritual texts, nor even pantheon lists are complete guides to the theology under discussion. (Cf. n. 1 to KTU 1.23.) Horon, who was evidently worshipped in the LBA-NK period throughout the Syro-Egyptian region, is also invoked in curses in KTU 1.2 i [7] and 1.16 vi 55. On the god see Xella (1972), Caquot (1979–80, 1982) and Rütersworden (1995).

26. Ug. *mṣdh*. Also a TN?

27. Caquot (1989: 89): 'because of its deed, the conjurer has died'.

28. Most commentators make no comment on the omission of this tricolon from the end of strophe XII. Its restoration is hypothetical (cf. the inadvertent omission of strophe VII above). Cf. Astour (1968: 15, 22): 'the final tristich is missing...this is hardly a case of scribal omission'!

29. Ug. *trġn*: √*rġn*, Ar. *raġana*, 'incline (the body)' Astour (1968: 22), followed by Caquot (1989: 89 n. 276). Cf. Pardee (1988a: 214). The subject is the mare.

30. Lit. 'bereaved (sc. of offspring)', which leads Caquot (1989: 90 n. 277) to propose an alternative for *bnwth* (here construed as 'her offspring'), deriving it from *nwt* (Heb. *nāvê*, 'pasturage, dwelling').

31. 'His virility': Astour (1968: 22).

32. Ug. *ykr*. This sense (cf. Ar. *karra*) accepted by Xella (1981: 236-37), Kottsieper (1984: 106) and Pardee (1988a: 215). Or 'left' (Syr. *'etnakrī*): Virolleaud (1968: 570, with hesitation), Astour (1968: 23), Lipiński (1974:) and Caquot (1989: 90). For other suggestions see ibid. n. 278.

Then
he set his face towards Aršḫ abounding in rain,
and well-watered Aršḫ[34].

He uprooted[35] from among the trees the tamarisk[36],
1.100 V 65 and from among the shrubs the tree of death[37].

With the tamarisk he shook it out[38];
with the fruit-cluster[39] he drove it away[40];
with the foliage[41] he dismissed it;

33. Or: 'primaeval': Caquot (1989: 90 n. 278, 'antique') cf. de Moor (1988a). On the nuances of *qdm* see Wyatt (1996a: 354-56).

34. On the ways of interpreting this urban formula see n. 80 at KTU 1.14 iii 4-5. Ug. *Aršḫ*: presumably a city-name. Astour (1968: 23), and Bowman and Coote (1980: 137), take it to refer to the Tigris (Hur. *Araššiḫ*, 'Tigris'). A watery interpretation of the formula fits the river well, and in my view clinches the choice of option. A water supply would also be essential for a city. Cf. *ṯr*, KTU 1.101.8.

35. Ug. *ydy*. Thus Astour 1968: 24. Others 'cast out'. (Heb. *yādâ*.) Cf. n. 1 to KTU 1.169.1.

36. Ug. *'r'r*. Thus most commentators, following Virolleaud (1968: 571). 'Juniper': Gray (1978: 83) and Johnstone (1978: 113). BDB (p. 792) gives 'juniper?' for Heb. *'arô'ēr* ('Ar. *'ar'ar*, juniper [or cypress?]'). See discussion and extensive refs. in Belmonte (1993: 114). In view of the uncertainty of identifying many ancient names for species with absolute precision, and the medicinal qualities and ritual associations of each, both candidates are possible.

37. For this syntax cf. Pardee (1988a: 215). De Moor (1988) suggests that the present text and KTU 1.107 preserve fragments of an Ugaritic version of the Eden story (Gen. 2–3). Perhaps a 'tree of death' is either the tree, or one of two trees, in a paradise.

38. Ug. *yn'rah* (corr. to *yn'rnh*), Heb. *nā'ar* II. In view of the final *-m* of *'r'rm*, perhaps instrumental, 'he performed a shaking action *with* the tamarisk', and similarly with the following cola. Thus Pardee 1988a: 216; Caquot 1989: 91-92.

39. Ug. *ssnm*. Usually translated 'date-cluster' or similarly: see rationale in Young (1977: 292-293); Belmonte (1993: 115). I take it as referring to tamarisk fruit, all the items used being parts of the *one* tree. The term may be generic for any bunched fruit or berry.

40. Ug. *ysynh*. Thus Astour (1968 p. 25) and Pardee (1988a: 216 n. 101; Ar. *nassa*). Cf. de Moor (1987: 154 and n. 29; Akk. *nesû*). 'Puts to the test': de Tarragon (1989: 92 n. 285: Heb. *nāsâ*).

41. Ug. *'dtnr*: lit. 'ornament'. Heb. √*'ādâ* II; cf. Bowman and Coote (1980: 136). 'Scab': de Moor (1987: 154; 1988a: 107). 'Reed bulb': Astour (1968: 22). 'Whirlpool': Dietrich and Loretz (1980a: 157), cf. del Olmo (1992a: 247). 'Heart of the reed': Pardee (1988a: 203). Cf. discussion in Belmonte (1993: 115). Cf Parker 1997: 222-23 and n. 7, and Pardee 2001b: 144.

with the roots[42] he carried it off[43].

Horon went to his house,
and came to his court.

The po<iso>n[44] became weak like a stream-bed,
it flowed away like a stream.

1.100 V 70 Behind her[45] the house[46] of incantation,
[C II] behind her the house she shut,
behind her the bronze (bolt)[47] she shot[48].

(Horon:)[49] 'Open the house, spell,
open the house that I may enter,

42. Ug. *yblt*. I take this and the preceding *'dtm* to be parts of the plant, hence taking Ug.-Heb. √*ybl* ('carry') as guide. Cf. *y^{e}bûl*, 'produce of soil'. 'Wart': de Moor (1987: 154; 1988a: 107). 'Twin-fruit': Greaves (1994: 166). Others in keeping with translations in previous note, or leaving untranslated.

43. There is an assonantal wordplay between each verb and its instrument in this tetracolon. The names have the character of the action. Cf. the names and functions of Baal's weapons. See Greaves (1994). Horon performs a magical, quasi-medical rite with the plant products, which drive the poison out, by 'dismissing' the snake. This is in reality the paradigm of the medical procedures effective against snakebite. A theological sanction is thus given to (presumably) effective folk-medicine.

44. Ug. *ḫ<nr>t*, *KTU*^{2}. Alternatively, correcting to *ḫ<w>t* (de Tarragon 1989: 92): 'life flowed like a torrent, it flowed (back) like a stream'. Ug. *nḫl* may mean the empty wadi or the torrent rushing through it. Levine and de Tarragon combine the two alternatives, Horon causing poison to flow like a river.

45. 'Her... she...'. Presumably this is Mare, the horse-goddess who invokes all the deities. Her spell having proved efficacious, she leaves the shrine where she had invoked the other deities.

46. The form *bhtm* is plural.

47. Ug. *tlt*: lit. 'three'. 'Three times': Dietrich and Loretz (1980a: 157). 'Bronze': Pardee (1988a: 203). Cf. Johnstone (1978: 118) who refers to the tradition of Num. 21.8-9 (see below, n. 49).

48. Lit. 'set, placed' (Ug. *'dbt*).

49. The rubrics are those of Levine and de Tarragon. Whether these are the characters who utter these words remains uncertain, however. But the idea of having as an apotropaic talisman a model of the very danger feared (in this mythological account the talisman consists of a live snake) is entirely plausible. Cf. the small bronze serpent found at Timna, though this is interpreted as votive and compared with Num. 21.8-9 (Rothenberg 1972: 183-84 and pl. XIX). This kind of ritual is alive and well in Tennessee.

the palace that I may come in'.

(Mare:) 'Give me the snake[50] as <my gift>,
give me the lizard as my dowry[51],
and the young serpent as my present'.

1.100 V 75 'I shall give the snake as your dowry,
(Horon:) the young serpent as your present'.[52]

edge After Reshef: Athtart—'to Athtart in Mari, a spell against the bite of a snake...'.

50. Ug. *nḥšm* perhaps pl., but the parallel *bṯn* suggests that it is sg. with enclitic *m*. De Moor (1987: 155): 'a serpent'.

51. An addition to an older bicolonic formula? Cf. the final bicolon. On the other hand, Wilfred Watson has proposed to me (oral communication) that the line may have been inadvertently omitted from the last bicolon (which would therefore be a tricolon). However, the introduction of a lizard is a poor parallel to a serpent, especially if it is the serpent who is the villain of the piece. Cf. *KTU*^{2} 's suggestion, reading *y ḥr<n>*: 'O Horon'. Ug. *yḥr* may mean 'lizard' (if to be defended here) on basis of Ar. *waḥarah*, 'lizard' (thus Johnstone 1978: 115).

52. Perhaps we are to suppose that the now harmless snake is returned as a wedding-gift to Mare. If so, the birth of the foal must be premarital (cf. Nikkal's premarital dalliance in KTU 1.24 and perhaps the plot of Gen. 34 [Wyatt 1990a]). I am grateful to Wilfred Watson for this suggestion.

KTU 1.101: A Hymn to Baal Enthroned

(KTU 1.101 = RS 24.245)

Select Bibliography

Virolleaud 1962, 1968: 557-59; Fisher and Knutson 1969; de Moor 1969a: 180-83, 1987: 1-2; Lipiński 1971b; Pope and Tigay 1971; Margulis (Margalit) 1974; Pardee 1988a: 119-52; Xella 1996: 396-98.

A hymn. Baal is imagined enthroned on Mt Saphon, attended by Anat, and is almost assimilated to the mountain itself, as the clouds and snows of the summit are described as attributes of the god's head. But the 'nature hymn' style is misleading. It is simile and metaphor, not literal description. This is a portrait of a transcendent deity. Lines are traced across the tablet and the text written between them. Perhaps a scribal exercise. De Moor regards it as the prologue to the 'Baal Cycle' of myths (KTU 1.1–1.6).

1.101 R 1 Baal sits like the base of a mountain[1];
Hadd se[ttles][2] as the ocean[3],

in the midst of his divine mountain, Saphon,
in [the midst of [4]] the mountain of victory.

Seven lightning-flashes [ ],
eight bundles[5] of thunder[6],

1. Virolleaud (1968: 558): 'Baal sits, (having) for a throne (his) mountain'. Lipiński (1971a: 82): 'Baal is seated, for [*k*] the mountain is a throne'. While Saphon is indeed Baal's throne, it is rather a comparison of the fixity of the throne: as firm as its mountain-base ('dwelling' or 'seat'); cf. Xella (1996: 396). But in any case hardly 'Baal sits as a mountain sits' (thus Margalit 1974: 2; taking *ṯbt* as G inf. construct). Margalit (1974: 2, 14) also takes *ġr* to be 'mule' (*k mdb* of l. 2 construed as *km db*, 'like a bear')!

2. Ug. *r* [ ]. Virolleaud (1968: 558) restores *r* ['*y*]: 'Hadd the shepherd'. Cf. KTU 1.108.3 and rejection of this sense. Others have restored *r*[*bṣ*] (de Moor 1969a: 180; citing KTU 1.13.9), though the word-pair *yṯb* || *r bṣ* is otherwise unattested.

3. Cf. de Moor (1969a: 181) and KTU 1.23.35 above. The double simile speaks of fixity and ubiquity. As Fisher and Knutson (1969: 158 n. 7) observe, *mdb* denotes Yamm: Baal is enthroned on his cadaver. On this see Wyatt 1995a.

4. Fisher and Knutson (1969: 158 n. 8) plausibly restore *b*[*tk*].

5. Ug. *iṣr*. For the sense 'bundle' see Renfroe (1992: 84), followed by Xella

a tree-of-lightning [in his] ri[ght hand].[7]

1.101 R 5 His head is magnificent,
His brow is dew-drenched[8].
his feet are eloquent in (his) wrath[9].

[His] horn is [exal]ted[10];
his head is in the snows[11] in heaven,
[with] the god there is abounding water[12].

(1996: 397). Ar. *ʾṣr*, 'bundle'; Heb., Aram. √*ʾṣr*, 'gather, stack, pile'. Cf. also Heb. √*ṣrr* I. Cf. also Heb. *ʾôṣār*, pl. *ʾôṣārôt*, 'storehouse'. So Fensham (1971a: 24) and J. Day (1985: 59). But a storehouse can hardly be held in the hand, which is I suspect the point of the tricolon, so that the former sense is preferable. Cf. *DLU*, 56.

6. *r't*. Fisher and Knutson (1969: 159) correct *r't* to *r'm* , and construe as 'storehouses of thunder'. So also Fensham (1971a: 24) and J. Day (1985: 59). To **r'm*, cf. Heb. *ra'am*, 'thunder'.

7. Cf. the 'Baal au Foudre' stela in the Louvre (RS 4.427), though Baal holds the combined tree-spear-lightning stroke in his *left* hand! Margalit (1971: 481-82; 1974: 5, 14) reads *ṣ.brqy*['].*išh*: 'a tree with its head in the firma[ment]'. Note *ANET*, 249: 'Baal smites thee with the cedar tree that is in his hand'.

8. Ug. *tly.bn.'nh*. Lit. 'he is dewy between the eyes'. Cf. Fisher and Knutson (1969: 159). Preferable to 'Tallayu [Taliy] made his head wonderful between (his) eyes' (de Moor 1969a: 180; cf. 1987: 2).

9. Ug. *uz'rt.tmll.išdh*. Cf. Fisher and Knutson (1969: 159): for *uz'rt* cf. Akk. *zā'iru* ('enemy', 'be hostile') here taken as f. abstract. For *tmll* cf. Heb. √*mll* I: 'speak'. To *išd* cf. Heb.*'ešed*, 'foundation', 'base'. (But cf. Akk. *išdu*, 'phallus', and common use of *rglym* which occurs in Prov. 6.13, often cited. Pope and Tigay [1971: 128] even suggest a sexual nuance for *uz'rt*.) Others take the whole section to be a series of actions by Baal's consorts, who massage his body. See, e.g., de Moor (1987: 2: Taliy) and Pardee (1988a: 125, 139, 141: Taliy, Bittu Rabbi and Uz'aratu). The last two are otherwise unattested. Avishur (1980: 126) has Taliy delousing him! In a hymn?!

10. Text: *qrn*[ ] [ ]*t.'lh*. *KTU*[2] reads *qrn*[m] b*t*, and suggests d*t*. The *b* is inferred from the context as construed (see previous note), and only the top right wedge is partially visible. I read, conjecturally, *qrn*[*h*] [*rm*]*t.'lh*. There is certainly room for a *r* before the putative *b* (my *m*). For the expression 'exalt the horn' in Heb., see 1 Sam. 2.10 and Ps. 89.25, of the king. Elsewhere (6 times in Pss.) of people. Here qatil pass. pt. (cf. Andromeda < **'Anat*[*u*] *Ramit*[*u*]: Wyatt 1988a: 376 and n. 11).

11. Ug. *glṯ*. metathesis of Heb., Aram. *šlg*, *tlg*, Ar. *ṯalg*. Margalit (1974: 10), 'bald' (Syr., Aram. *glš*, 'to scrape, shave, make bald'): noting that Mt Saphon is Ar. *Jebel el-Aqra*, 'Bald Mountain'. Fisher and Knutson's suggestion (1969: 159: 'his head is descending from the heave[ns]', cf. Song 4.1, 6.5) is implausible.

12. Cf. Pardee (1988a: 124, 145), restoring *'m*, and seeing *ṯr* as relating to Ar. *ṯarra*, 'give plentiful water' (Pope and Tigay 1971: 129). Cf. *ṯrt* in KTU 1.4 v 7

His mouth is like two clouds[13] [ ],
[his lips] like wine from jars,
his heart [ ]

1.101 R 10 ...

(indeterminate number of lines missing)

1.101 V (2 lines too damaged to yield sense)

[ ] the Gracious one [ ]
[ ] oil of peace was poured into[14] a bowl.

1.101 V 15 Virgin Anat [washed] her hands,
her fingers [the Beloved of] the Powerful One[15].

She took her lyre in her hand,
[she clasped] the bull-shaped instrument[16] to her breast.

She sang of the loves of Valiant Baal,
of the affection of <Pidray daughter of Light,>
[the desire of Taliy daughter of Shower,]
[the love of Arsiy daughter of Snatcher-for-ever.][17]

(text breaks off)

(Driver 1956: 151), *ṯrrt* in KTU 1.14 iii 5 etc., 1.100.64. Xella (1996: 397): 'in the heaven of Bull El' (*bšm* *[m d]*t i*l ṯr*).

13. Ug. *iṯ.ph.kṯt*^{l}*.ǵbt* [ ]. Fisher and Knutson's suggestion (1969: 159) makes sense, though they read *ǵbm*. (Heb. *'āb* has plurals in *-ôt* and *-îm*: here we would expect du.). Cf. Pardee (1988a: 125), who restores [*ṭl*]: 'two clouds [of dew]'. De Moor (1969: 182), '...cream of milk'.

14. Or 'from'. Cf. KTU 1.3 ii 31; 1.16 iii 1.

15. Ug. *yd... uṣb'th*. 'Hers' or 'his'? Du. and pl. respectively, or sg.? On latter readings is this 'penis... phallus' as elsewhere (e.g. KTU 1.10 iii 7-8)?

16. For this translation of *rimt* see KTU 1.3 iii 4 n. 36.

17. The V may be an independent composition. Cf. KTU 1.3 ii 31-33, iii 4-8, where substantially the same text is found. Here it is apparently Anat who sings (*tšr*, l. 17) while at KTU 1.3 iii 5 it is the minstrel who sings (*mšr*). See nn. 36, 37 *ad loc*.

KTU 1.107: A Cautionary Tale: Širuġazuz Learns the Risks of Snake-Charming

(KTU 1.107 = UT 608 = RS 24.251 + 262 + 265A + 267 + 275 + 279 + 283 + 286)

Select Bibliography

Virolleaud 1968: 574-580; Astour 1968; Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín 1975c; Xella 1981: 241-50; Levine and de Tarragon 1988; de Moor 1988a; Pardee 1988a: 227-57; de Tarragon 1989: 95-100; del Olmo 1992a: 249-51; Pardee 2001a: 176-85.

The text has the appearance of a story about Širuġazuz, who has been careless in practising snake-charming or snake-handling, and has been bitten. Shapsh intervenes, presumably to save him. The latter part of the text is an incantation for the cure of snake-bite. This application of a mythic form to a ritual context may also be seen in KTU 1.23 (famine-relief according to Cutler and Macdonald 1982), KTU 1.24 (weddings) and KTU 1.114 (excessive consumption of alcohol). Recto and verso: reverse order in Astour, Xella and *KTU*[1]. Present order in Pardee, Levine and de Tarragon, del Olmo and *KTU*[2]. Neither is certain, though the latter is preferable.

1.107 R 1 [ ]...[ ]
[ ] the great[1] gods...[ ]
[ ] in his hand
...the man's temple sweated profusely[2],
[ ] it let fall[3],
it bit...

1. Thus Xella (1981: 244). Pardee (1988a: 241-42): 'numerous'; Dietrich and Loretz (1990: 215-16). Cf. KTU 1.124.2.

2. Ug. *ydrm*: following de Moor's (1988a: 108 n. 21) suggestion that it is √*drr* (Ug., Heb., Ar. *darra*), 'to flow copiously'. Astour (1968: 33), cites Ar. *darama*, 'to fall out (of teeth)'. Could the broken word]r*ṣ at the beginning of the line to be restored as *ḥrṣ* (Heb. √I, 'be sharp'): 'the [sh]arp [fangs] fell out in his hand'? Was he trying to de-fang the snake? De Moor (1988: 108) reads *'ṣ* ([*yqh*] *'ṣ bdh*: 'he took the tree in his hand'). Contrast Levine and de Tarragon (1988: 493): 'with his arms he *strikes* (?) the temples of humankind'.

3. Ug. *yšql*. De Moor (1988: 108): [*nḥš*] *i*[*l*] *yšql*: 'and the serpent let fall the spittle (= venom)'.

1.107 R 5 [ ] po[is]on[4]...

He wanted to escape from it[5].
The snake's mouth [ ]

[How to bi]nd the bite[6] he did[7] not know;
he did not understand how to remove the poison.

The poison [ ] him
and the venom[8] convulsed him[9].

Širuġazuz[10] [fell in a se]izure[11],
he wept like a child,
[and shed tears] like an infant.

Shapsh called from heaven:

1.107 R 10 '[Why] have you fallen, O...?[12]
why have you fallen in a seizure, Širuġazuz,
and (why do you) weep[13] like a child,

4. Reading *ḥ*[*m*]*t* after de Moor (1988a: 108 *ḥ*[*m*]*t*), rather than *ṯ*[*b*]*t* (Pardee 1988a: 230; *KTU*[2]). The bottom wedge of *ḥ* has been overwritten by a word-divider in the next line.

5. Ug. *pẓr pẓrn*, rather than *pẓr pẓr*[*r*] of Pardee (1988a: 230); *KTU*[2]. On the sense the best approach is de Moor's (1988a: 108 and n. 23): 'frantically he tried to loosen it', taking *pẓr* to represent √*pṯr*, (Heb., Ar.). Others separate *p* and *ẓr*: *p*, 'and' or 'mouth'; *ẓr*...*ẓrr*. Pardee (1988a: 241) links with Heb. *ṣōr*, 'flint', (√*ṣrr* III) the second form being the denominative verb ('flint...cutter').

6. Ug. *nṯk*. Astour (1968: 33) and Pardee (1988a: 241): 'bite/biter', sc. the snake. Thus also de Moor (1988a: 109). Astour supposes that someone is trying to extract the snake's venom. On this translation, he fails. On Xella's (below) he succeeds.

7. Or: 'does' and so also in the following colon.

8. Ug. *abdy*. Lit. 'destroyer'. De Moor (1988: 109): 'destructive venom'.

9. Ug. *t'btnh*. Lit. 'twisted him' (√*'bt* = Heb. *'bt*). So Pardee (1988a: 241). Alternatively, 'made him powerless' (Astour 1968: 34: Ar. *ta'iba* conj. iv; de Tarragon [1989: 97 n. 300]).

10. This appears to be a PN, perhaps 'Favourite Child' (Astour 1968: 34). The vocalization is hypothetical. This is no doubt the apprentice snake-charmer.

11. Ug. *šr*. Astour (1968: 33-34): 'seizure' (Ar. *sawrat*, *sawār*). Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín (1975b: 130) and Xella (1981: 244, 249): 'trance' (Heb. *šrr*). Del Olmo (1992: 250 n. 126): 'disgrace' (Ar. *šarr*). Reading *bšr* as one word: 'the flesh of Sharrughazizu fell': de Moor (1988a: 109).

12. Cf. Pardee (1988a: 245).

13. For *tpky* read *tbky*. Cf. l. 8.

shed tears like an infant?'
Weeping, [Širuġazuz] replied,
...
['...] O Sha[psh?]
...'
[ ] and so on with the entire story...

1.107 R 15 Shapsh called from heaven:
...

(Ll. 16-25 fragmentary, followed by gap of perhaps about 10 lines)

1.107 V (First 10 lines approximately missing, followed by 6 fragmentary lines)

1.107 V 32 [ ]
'[Gather, Shap]sh, from the mountains [the thick cloud],
from the earth gather the power[14] of the poison.
[Gather, Sha]psh, from the mountain[s the thick c]loud,
from the earth [gather the power of] the poison.

1.107 V 35 From the mouth of the biter the venom,
from the mouth of the devourer [the toxin?[15]] gather.
The poison let [ ]
let [ ] [16] gather the poison.
[Gather, Sha]psh, from the mountain[s] the thick cl[oud],
from the earth gather [the power of] the poison.
Let[17] E[l] and Horon gather the poison;
Let [Baal] and Dagan gather the poison;

14. Following Levine and de Tarragon (1988: 493). Ug. *lan*: 'potency'.

15. Ug. *tmdl*, restored from l. 45. Meaning uncertain. See Astour (1968: 31: 'poison'), Xella (1981: 246-47: 'abundance'), Pardee (1988a: 250-51: 'evil'), Levine and de Tarragon (1988: 504: 'a plant') and del Olmo (1992a: 250: 'destruction').

16. The subjects of both cola are missing. Most suggest El or the gods as subject.

17. Jussive: so Levine and de Tarragon (1988: 493), de Tarragon (1989: 100) and del Olmo (1992a: 251). Past indic., Astour (1968: 30). Future indic., Pardee (1988a: 242).

1.107 V 40 Let Anat and Athtart gather the poison;
Let Yarih and Reshef gather[18] the poison;
Let Athtar and Athtapar gather the poison;
Let Zizzu and Kemosh[19] gather the poison;
Let Milk in Athtarat gather the poison;
Let Kothar-and-Hasis[20] gather the poison;
Let Shahar and Shalem gather the poison.

Gather, [Shap]sh, from the mountains the thick cloud:
1.107 V 45 from the earth you have [gat]hered <the power of[21]> the poison.

From the mouth of the biter the venom,
from the mouth of the devourer the toxin? [you have gathered].'
...

18. Text *ḫisp*. Correct to *yisp*.
19. Text *ktṯ*. Correct to *kmṯ*.
20. The formula suggests that the two names are treated as independent gods. Levine and de Tarragon (1988: 493) treat each pair as a binomial 'E[l-and]-Horon' etc.
21. This is missing from the text.

KTU 1.108: An Intercessory Prayer to Rapiu and other Deities

(KTU 1. 108 = RS 24.252)

Select Bibliography

Virolleaud 1968: 551-57; de Moor 1969a: 175-79, 1987: 187-90; Margalit (Margulis) 1970a; Parker 1970; Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín 1975a; Caquot 1976; L'Heureux 1979: 169-87; Dietrich and Loretz 1980b; Spronk 1986: 177-89; Pardee 1988a: 75-118; de Tarragon 1989: 111-18; R.M. Good 1991; del Olmo 1992a: 125-30; Clemens 1993; Aboud 1994: 149-57; Avishur 1994: 277-307; Rouillard 1995.

A hymnic prayer accompanying libations (a 'psalm': Margalit). As with KTU 1.101, lines are drawn across the tablet and the text written between them, suggesting a scribal exercise. As for the text, most commentators see it as addressed to Rapiu, though some wish to identify him with El or Baal.

1.108 R 1 May[1] Rapiu[2], King of Eternity[3], drink [wi]ne[4],
yea, may he drink, the powerful and noble [god][5],
the god[6] enthroned in Athtarat,
the god who rules[7] in Edrei[8],

1. The verbs in the bicolon may be jussive (volitive) or indicative.

2. The identity of Rapiu ('healer') is much debated. A form of Baal: Dietrich and Loretz (1980b: 179); an independent deity: Parker (1970: 243-44); El: Avishur (1994). Is he perhaps the prototype of Gk Orpheus?

3. Cf. Cooper (1987). 'Eternal' as an epithet of Rapiu would rather be *'llmy*, as in KTU 1.22 i 10. See also n. 16 to KTU 1.161.7.

4. The text begins [ ]*n*. Borger (1969: 3) proposed reading [*y*]*n*, which has been widely accepted, as here. The noun would then be serving double duty, in both cola. Virolleaud (1968: 551): [*aph*]*n*. Pardee (1988a: 83): [*h*]*n*. This last is an acceptable alternative. Del Olmo (1992a: 127), reading [*hl*]*n*..., translates 'Rapau has been established'.

5. Epithets of Rapiu rather than further gods. See discussion in Avishur (1995: 283-86). Cf. del Olmo (1992a: 127), who translates: 'Ilu has established Gaṯaru Yaqaru'—the eponymous founder of the dynasty.

6. Ug. *il*. Hardly El, as supposed by Levine and de Tarragon (1984: 656).

7. 'Enthroned... rules' (Ug. *yṯb, ṯpṭ*): the verbs (both qatala in form) carry both royal and judicial nuances. The degree of political ideology in theological contexts in Ugaritic religious discourse (as in biblical language) is significant.

whom men hymn and honour with music[9]
on the lyre and the flute,
on drum and cymbals,
1.108 R 5 with castanets of ivory,
among the goodly companions of Kothar[10].

And may Anat the power<ful>[11] drink,

the mistress of kingship,
the mistress of dominion,

the mistress of the high heavens,
[the mistre]ss[12] of the earth[13].

8. 'Athtarat... Edrei': cf. Astour (1968: 21) and Margalit (1970a: 294). The other approach to this ('the god who sits with Athtart... the god who rules with Hadd the shepherd'—see de Moor 1976, and most recently Avishur 1995: 287-88, [69]) is less convincing. For apparent *hdr'* of text read *idr'* as proposed by Margalit (1970a: 294), the fourth stroke of the consonant being omitted. This *is* a school exercise! The two cities are in the Hauran (biblical Bashan), south of Damascus, showing the considerable geographical range of the Ugaritic religious world, along with Egypt and Crete, homes of Kothar, (KTU 1.3 vi 13-16 etc.).

9. Clemens (1993): active. Or impersonal: 'one sings...'. Del Olmo (1987: 51; 1992: 127). Good (1991): passive: 'who is hymned and celebrated'. This approach seems inherently more plausible than an active sense, with the god as subject, as for de Moor (1969a: 175: a shepherd god, Pan-like?; 1987: 188: no longer a shepherd) and Pardee (1988a: 81). This is cultic music played and sung in the god's honour, accompanying libations. Cf. the same verbs used of cult in Pss. 68.5; 105.2.

10. Good (1991: 158): 'with the beautiful chords of the cithar'. Rejected by Clemens (1993: 73-74).

11. Ug. *gtr*. (Cf. the same form in l. 2.) 'The strong': Virolleaud (1968: 555), correcting to *gtrt*; de Moor (1969a: 175-76) and Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín (1975a: 115). Heb. √*gšr*, Akk. *gašāru*. 'Of Gathru': de Moor (1987: 188, toponym? DN?). 'of Gathar' (sc. toponym?): de Tarragon (1989: 115). A drink: Margalit (Margulis) (1970a: 293). A DN: del Olmo (1992a: 127-28 and nn. 58, 61). 'Of power': Pardee (1988a: 82 [discussion p. 91 n. 55]). Del Olmo (1992a: 128) translates the line ' 'Anatu has also established Gaṯaru'.

12. Reading [*b'l*]*t* rather than ['*n*]*t* as proposed by Pardee (1988a: 82). (*KTU*^{2}: [b']l*t*, but only the *t* is visible.) The position of the colon in the overall prosody depends on the meaning of *kpt* (next note). I take it as a contrastive parallel with the preceding colon (heaven: earth).

13. Ug. *kpt*. 'Earth': Virolleaud (1968: 55 [Heb. *kebeš*, Akk. *kapašu*]). Perhaps even 'Mistress of trampling', on this etymology, with military overtones? Usually taken to mean 'turban' or some article of headdress (e.g. de Moor 1969a: 178;

And may Anat fly[14],
may the kite[15] soar [in] the hig<h> [heav]ens,
(who) ate the calf of E[l,[16]
1.108 R 10 drinking[17] [ ][18] from the horn.
And may the god [ ] drink,
the god who subdued[19] the calf of El[20].
[ ] the god Shad[21].
May the King [of Eternity] hunt[22]...
[ ]...
[ ]...
1.108 R 15 [ ] Reshef

1972: II, 24; Gibson 1978: 149; 'diadem': L'Heureux 1979: 177). 'Firmament' (synonymous parallelism): del Olmo (1992a: 128 n. 62 [no etymology]). Anat's headdress is the Egyptian Atef crown.

14. Ug. *di<y>* (as following *di<y>t*). Defectively spelt G qatala f. sg. or inf. abs., either with volitive force? 'Flying': de Tarragon (1989: 116). 'Wings': de Moor (1969a: 175, 178) and Pardee (1988a: 82). 'Kite': de Moor (1987: 188). Perhaps a pupil's spelling error.

15. Anat flies among a flock of falcons in the Aqhat story (KTU 1.18 iv 21) and appears winged on a stela (thus Yon 1991: 291; RS 2.[038]). The Eg. goddesses Isis and Nephthys appear as kites. But *di<y>*, *di<y>t* are not to be taken as belonging to the same colon, as this results in an ugly tautology: 'the flying bird' (thus Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín 1975a: 115).

16. Or: 'divine calf' (thus del Olmo 1992a: 128). But hardly 'heifer' (*'glt*) as de Moor (1969a: 175). Text *tl*. Read *il*. See l. 11 below. On the character of this error see Pardee (1988a: 79).

17. Ug. *mšt*. 'At the feast': Pardee (1988a: 82).

18. Text [ ]*mr*. Del Olmo (1992: 128), restores to [*ḫ*]*mr*, which he takes to be 'wine'. It is rather a container (see KTU 1.3 i 16 [discussion at n. 9], 1.15 iv 23 and 1.23.6). Unless it be metonymy.

19. Ug. *ǵnṯ*. 'Subdued': de Moor (1969a: 175, 178) and Dietrich and Loretz (1980a: 177: causative D stem, cf. Akk. *ḫanāšu*, *ḫañašu*, by-forms of *kanāšu*, 'submit'). A further epithet of El, or another god (Virolleaud [1968: 555]: Ar. *ǵnṯ*, 'drink, breathing at each draught', followed by del Olmo [1992a: 128] but as a vb). The DN Ḫaniš (cf. Virolleaud): Pardee (1988a: 82, 109: see n. 174 on latter page).

20. Cf. n. 16 above.

21. Cf. Loretz (1980) and Caquot (1995) on this god as a possible antecedent of El Shaddai.

22. Text *šdyṣdmlk* [ ]. No word-divider, and continuous with *šd* (tentatively identified as a god: see preceding line. De Moor (1969: 176), restores [*'lm*]. Cf. l. 1.

(bottom of tablet missing)

1.108 V [ ]...
[ ]...
[[23]] intercede with Baal
1.108 V 20 [ ] your achievement[24], Rapiu King [of Eternity]
your [ ], your efficacy[25], your] intercession.
[With the [26]] of Rapiu, King of Eternity,
with the strength of [Rapiu] King of Eternity,
with his help, with [his] p[ower],
by his rule[27], by his splendour
among the Sa[viou]rs of the underworld.
1.108 V 25 May your strength, your help, your power,
your rule, your splendour,
be in the midst of Ugarit,
throughout the days and months,
and the gracious years of El.

23. Pardee (1988a: 82) plausibly understands Rapiu to be the subject of this sentence.

24. Ug. *mġk*. Lit. 'your arrival', 'your coming'.

25. Ug. *tštk*. 'Success', 'confidence': Dietrich and Loretz (1980a: 174, 178); 'success': Pardee (1988a: 112 n. 189). Others take this to be a verbal form (√*šyt*): thus de Moor (1969a: 176): 'will put you...'.

26. Whatever quality is missing here (l. 21) is not balanced in the otherwise identical list of qualities in the following strophe.

27. Ug. *ḥtkh*. 'Rule' (√ as Heb. *ḥātak*). Thus de Moor (1969a: 179). The homonym *ḥtk* means 'scion' in the expression *ḥtk dgn* in KTU 1.10 iii 34 (*pace* Wyatt 1992a: 415-16). The kinship aspect may persist in the sense of power, as de Moor notes ('[paternal] rulership...'). Cf. Margalit (1970a: 296-70) and de Moor (1987: 189-90: 'patronage'). Healey (1980) suggests 'care', as in KTU 1.6 vi 46-47. Cf. Renfroe 1992: 93.

KTU 1.113: A Royal Liturgy, and the Ugaritic King-List

(KTU 1.113 = RS. 24.257)

Select Bibliography

Virolleaud 1968: 561-62; Kitchen 1977; Dietrich and Loretz 1980b; Xella 1981: 288-91; del Olmo 1986, 1992a: 121-23; Pardee 1988a: 165-78; Lewis 1989: 47-52; Aboud 1994: 3-11; Schmidt 1994: 67-71, 1996; Younger 1997.

The recto of this little tablet appears to contain elements of a royal liturgy,[1] probably invoking ancestral kings,[2] among whom would be the *Rpum* (see KTU 1.20–1.22 and 1.161). (Pardee [1988a: 170] is at pains to stress its [para-]*mythological* character.) The verso contains a list of royal names in two columns, unfortunately very mutilated. Kitchen's article (1977) is a brilliant reconstruction of the list. Each king's name is preceded by *il*,[3] indicating that dead kings at least were divinized (cf. Wyatt 2000). Whether this list was used in conjunction with the putative liturgy on the recto remains unclear. A list of royal names going back over several centuries constitutes important evidence of an awareness of historical reality ('national memory') among the people of

1. Pardee (1988a: 170, 172) has drawn attention to the lack of appropriate terminology, but Schmidt (1994: 68) has noted that 'it is wrought with mythological vocabulary'.

2. *Pace* Schmidt (1994: 69).

3. It is possible that this designation is no more than a technical term meaning that the king is dead: it is used only of dead kings. But the balance of probability favours a specific theological content, particularly in view of the evidence for a form of divine kingship in Ugarit, as found in the Keret story. Perhaps in terms of reading the tablet it serves as a graphic marker, like the Akk. divine determinative. The following technical terms are used of the living king: in KTU 1.16 i 10 he is called *bnm il*, which makes him a member of the genre 'deity' (see n. 202 *ad loc.*); in KTU 1.14 i 37 etc. El is called *ab adm* with reference to him (n. 30 *ad loc.*), while in KTU 1.14 i 41 El is called *ṯr abh*, a term otherwise restricted to deities; and in KTU 1.14 i 40-41 etc. he is called *ġlm il* (see n. 32 *ad loc.* and n. 99 at KTU 1.2 i 13). Later Heb. usage (as at 1 Sam. 28.13) has *ʾĕlōhîm* denote the ghost of Samuel. But this usage is not attested at Ugarit. Schmidt (1994: 19, 69-70) takes up Liverani's (1974: 340-41) proposal that the *il* PN formula occurring here denoted not the deified dead king but rather the divine guardian of the king. He himself wonders whether the term *ilib* does not denote a collective of such personal deities, and rejects any link with a *kispum*-ritual.

Ugarit. (See n. 13.) A number of horizontal lines are scored across the tablet on the recto. Two vertical lines divide the two columns of the verso. These are shown below. The list is retrograde, with the earliest kings last. As Kitchen demonstrates, this is perfectly regular practice in the ancient world.[4]

1.113	R	1	[who has d]ied[5] and is to play[6] his tambourine, and the people [ ] to the Gracious One[7].
			[ ] and the flutes are to be played [ ] to the Gracious One.
1.113	R	5	[who] has died and is to play his tambourine, [ ]...to the Gracious One. [ ] he will come.

4. See Liverani (1962), Saadé (1979) and Klengel (1969, 1979, 1992). For a useful recent survey of later Ugaritic history see Kuhrt (1995: 300-14), Singer (1999).

5. For reading [d m]t see *KTU*[2]. Cf. l. 5.

6. Ug. *rm*. Lit. 'raise up'. Virolleaud (1968: 561): 'the strong sound or voice' (cf. Deut. 27.14). Similarly Xella (1981: 289).

7. Ug. *n'm*. The reference is unclear, here and in ll. 4, 6, 9 and 10. Is this a divine epithet? A title of the living king? (There are no parallels to this—for titles see colophon at KTU 1.6 vi 57-58 and KTU 7.63, discussed by del Olmo [1992a: 121]). 'Chorister'? 'Sweet sound'? Dietrich and Loretz (1980b: 179) go for the first option, Pardee (1988a: 169) appears to do so but with great caution, and suggests Rapiu as the god in question; Kitchen (1977: 140) and Xella (1981: 291) go for the second, Virolleaud (1968: 561) for the third, and del Olmo (1992a: 122) for the fourth. I am torn between Pardee's cautious view, and the idea that it may be a form of address for individual *dead* kings, who are evoked with music, to participate in a community celebration with the living (the *kispum*-ritual). Perhaps the list of kings at the end was used for a long litany, in which the liturgical text was applied to each royal ancestor in turn, throughout the list. What may seem to us the interminable length of such a procedure was perhaps perfectly normal for them. Cf. the length of Ps. 119! As some of the kings (though none listed: for these see KTU 1.161) are *rpum*, it is possible (following Pardee's suggestion) that Rapiu as their patron forms the link between the two realms. This would not formally constitute a cult of the dead, but rather the invocation of ancestors to share, as a communion of saints, in the rites of the living. Schmidt (1994: 68-69) discusses the usage of *n'm*, and concludes that in the present context it denotes a god, whom he is however hesitant to identify.

[ ]and the flutes are to be played,
[to the Gra]cious One.

1.113 R 10 [ ] the Gracious One[8].
...

1.113 V ...

[ ][9]	[ ]
[ ]	[divine Ammi]thtam[ru] (I),
[ ]	[divine Ni]qmepa (IV),
1.113 V 15 [ ]	divine Ammu<ra>pi'[11] (II),
[ ]	divine Ibiranu (IV),
[ ]	divine Yaḏiradu,
[divine Ammithtam]ru? (III),	divine Niqmepa (III),
[divine Niqme]pa? (VI)[10],	divine Ibiranu (III),

8. Kitchen (1977: 140) proposes that the recto is a hymn to Rapiu. This is a reasonable hypothesis (though scarcely provable) in so far as he is likely to have been the patron deity of the *rpum*, deified dead kings. He further suggests that 'the Gracious One' is not a deity, but the reigning king.

9. Kitchen (1977: 133-34, 137) proposes the following names as missing at the beginning of the left column, on the assumption that the latest king on the list (dead and deified) was Niqmad III (> IV), father of the last king of all, Ammurapi: in retrograde order [Niqmad III(> IV), Ibiranu II (> VI), Ammiṯtamru II (> IV), Niqmepa VI, Arhalbu II, Niqmad II (> III), Ammiṯtamru I (> III), lost]. The revised numberings he gives are those in parenthesis. The four Niqmads he obtains are without reading this name in l. 20 left. Cf. n. 132 at KTU 1.6 vi 57, and 27 at KTU 1.161.12-13, and see also n. 11 below).

10. There is a problem of the reading in ll. 18-20 left:

Line	*KTU*[1] (1976)	Kitchen (1977)	Pardee (1988a)	*KTU*[2] (1996)	My Reading
18 left	[ ]×	trace	[ ]	[il 'mṯṯm]r	[il 'mṯṯm]r
19 left	[ ]×	trace	[ ]*p*?[	[il nqm]d	[il nqm]p'
20 left	[ ]b	Arḫal]bu	[ ]*d* [	[il arḫl]b[	[il arḫl]b

A colour slide only demonstrates the intractability of the problem. Line 18 could be the end of an *r*, or an *n*, l. 19 is certainly not a *d*, and is very plausibly interpreted as a *p*, with a possible trace of an ' following, while l. 20 shows what may be either a whole *b* or most of a *d*. (Thus it could be identified as either Arḫalbu [I] or as Niqmad [III].) Schmidt (1994: 67) reads a provisional *d*, thus supporting the latter option. It is interesting how a crucial historical problem can depend on such tiny

1.113 V 20	[divine Arhal]bu[?] (I),	[div]ine Ammurapi (I),
	[divine Niq]mepa (V),	[divine] Niqmepa (II),
	[divine Ammith]tamru (II),	divine Ibiranu (II),
	[divine Niqma]d (II),	divine Niqmepa (I),
upper edge	[ ]	divine Ibiranu (I),
1.113 V 25	[ ]	divine Niqmad (I),
	[ ]	divine Yaqaru[12].[13]

pieces of evidence. I read l. 19 as [il nqm]p', in Rom. in view of the uncertainty. However, this gives us the sequence, in reverse order, of Arḫalbu, Niqmepa, Ammiṯtamru, which is confirmed by other documentation. Arḫalbu (II) was the childless king who was succeeded by his brother Niqmepa (VI), and whose 'will' survives in the Akk. text RS 16.144 (Nougayrol 1955: 76; Tsevat 1958). Tsevat takes this to be a case of the levirate. I believe it to show on the contrary that legitimate tenure of the throne was dependent on marrying the *rabītu*, a matrilineal system which has also been claimed for Egypt. See Wyatt (1985b) for the proposal that a similar legal convention was observed in Judah. Note the differentiation of *two* kings Niqmad in KTU 1.161.12-13 by Bordreuil and Pardee (1992: 158). See n. 27 *ad loc*.

11. Correction. Text *'mph*. Read **'m<r>pi*? The *h* may simply be a defective *i* (see Pardee 1988a: 175 n. 39).

12. The list above consists of 28 names or appropriate gaps. Kitchen (1977: 135) estimates it as having had *at least* 28 names, with 30 the likely number. But if the tablet is to be dated before the time of Ammurapi at the end of the twelfth century, then the complete list would be longer (30 + any later ones down to Ammurapi) and he allows for this. Pardee (1988a: 173) estimates that the full list on the original tablet may have contained as many as 52 names. The list is in reverse order, Yaqaru being the dynastic founder to whom all later kings traced their ancestry. Is this to be construed as based upon an official genealogy (though not here serving as such)? Genealogies served a number of ideological and other social purposes, as they still do. See next note.

13. The retrograde order of the king-list (Kitchen 1977), in which the most remote in the past are the most remote in the list, as it is read from the beginning, is analogous to the perspective of ancient Ugaritic culture, as attested in its vocabulary, in looking into the past as part of their canonical orientation, outlined in Wyatt (1996a). This makes of the present text an important piece of evidence supporting my interpretation, and furthermore, it indicates that this is a historiographical document of the utmost importance. The text may be compared with that of the Abydos king-list (Kemp 1989: 22 and fig. 4; Hoffmeier 1997: 69-70), in which Seti I and his son Rameses (> II) are shown venerating a canonical list of their ancestors, tracing their past back to Menes (= Narmer?). The Eg. example is slightly different, in that while all the names of the past are in front of the king and prince, Menes begins the list (top left) and is therefore paradoxically nearer the present than his

successors. Fifty-six kings of the Old Kingdom are listed (dyns. 1-8), followed by nine kings of the Middle Kingdom (dyns. 11-12), nine of the 18th dynasty and finally Rameses I and Seti himself of the 19th. Kings of the intermediate periods and two 18th dynasty kings are omitted. The proximity of Menes may itself be a pointer to an appeal by the Egyptian kings to their prototypical ancestor, to whom was credited the unification of Egypt. They thus go back directly to their roots, only subsequently looking to the intermediate figures of the past who constitute the apostolic succession. The omission of those kings and even entire dynasties that were seen by later ages as discredited is itself an indication that this king-list too is strictly historiographical, in the sense that a process of deliberate selection, amounting to a historical judgment, has taken place before the acceptable text is committed to the walls. The kings of the Ug. list may also be selective. We shall see reason to believe this in the omission of Ibiranu from KTU 1.161 below. We have no means of knowing whether this is (in the original form of the text) a complete list of kings going back into the third millennium, to a putative 'founder' Yaqaru, son of a non-royal Niqmad, or whether it too is the product of ideological selection. In any event, a line of descent, quite probably fictitious (so far as genetic descent is concerned throughout the line) is traced back from the present for a period of some centuries, linking each king to his predecessor. Kitchen estimates a period of up to seven hundred years. Though 'sonship' is not attributed here, it is likely that a father-and-son relationship between each of them was imagined, for this was part of the legitimization which was undoubtedly the object of the exercise. I have added numbers in the present list simply to show how many of certain PNs occur on the list. These are the revised numbers given by Kitchen.

KTU 1.114: The Myth of El's Banquet: A Medical Text

(KTU 1.114 = RS. 24.258)

Select Bibliography

Virolleaud 1968: 545-51; Loewenstamm 1969; de Moor 1969a: 167-75, 1970c, 1984, 1987: 134-37; Margulis (Margalit) 1970a, 1979–80; Fensham 1971a: 22, 1972; Pope 1972; Jackson 1974; Rainey 1974: 184-87; Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín 1975h; Xella 1977; L'Heureux 1979: 159-69; Cathcart and Watson 1980; Dietrich and Loretz 1981: 88-98, 1993; Spronk 1986: 196-202; Pardee 1988a: 13-74, 1997c: 302-305; Caquot 1989: 71-78; Watson 1990; McLaughlin 1991: 270-74; Cathcart 1996; T.J. Lewis in Parker 1997: 193-96.

This small tablet, of which perhaps the bottom quarter is missing (which would amount to about 12 lines) is in the form of a myth, narrating a feast held by El in his temple, culminating in El falling down drunk and being carried off home in a state of collapse. The last 3 lines (29-31), separated from the main text by a faintly scored horizontal line, consist of medical instructions on how to cure a hangover. We tend to think of intoxication as a purely secular and disreputable matter. To the ancients the effects of alcohol were understood to be a form of divine possession, and the consumption of copious draughts of wine was an important feature of cultic as well as social activity. Here was a form of worship into which all could enter with a will! In Ugarit, as in other WS societies, there was a regular institution established for communal drinking, perhaps a mixture of social club and religious association, known as the *marziḥu*. Texts such as KTU 3.9[1] detail legal procedures in the organization of such 'clubs', which were usually dedicated to a particular patron deity. The so-called 'temple aux rhytons'[2] discovered in the centre of the tell at Ras Shamra, with a niche at the west end and benches round the walls, may have been the temple of El, mentioned as 'his house' in ll. 1 and 17, and perhaps the same building or an adjacent one to the *mrzḥ* mentioned in l. 15.[3] This however remains unproven. The interpretation of Margalit (1979–80: 117),

1. See Fenton (1977), Halpern (1979–80), Friedman (1979–80) and Dietrich and Loretz (1982).
2. See Mallet (1987) and Yon (1987b, 1996).
3. See also Mallet (1987), Yon (1996) and Pardee (1997c: 303).

who in the tradition of Pope (1955) and Oldenburg (1969) sees this as evidence for a 'slighting of El' in a history of rivalry between his cult and that of Baal, and the comparable view of de Moor (1987: 134-35), who estimates that 'his shameful conduct is indicative of his impending downfall...' are in my view equally without foundation. This is not only to import an alien ethic (indeed an absurdly moralistic posturing) into the interpretation of ancient texts, but to misconstrue the symbolic parameters of this kind of mythology. El's behaviour, like that of Thor, Soma, Zeus and other gods with gargantuan appetites for liquor, is regarded as heroic. The ethos is still alive in the Celtic societies in western Europe!

The notes below do not attempt a full survey of the huge range of meanings offered for most of the controversial words in this text. The text has been interpreted as a palimpsest in view of the number of words appearing in diminutive script between ll. 7 and 10 (see Dietrich and Loretz 1993, *KTU*^{2}, 129), but these may also be construed as interlinear glosses or corrections (thus Margalit). A horizontal line (in addition to the one noted above) appears half-way across the tablet between ll. 7 and 8.

1.114 R 1 In his house El[4] gave a feast[5] of game,
the produce of the hunt[6] in the midst of his palace[7].

4. Confirmation that *il* here is the DN El, rather than the generic term, is given by the expression *il abh*, 'El his father', occurring in l. 14.

5. Ug. *dbḥ*: lit. 'slaughter', with the contextual senses of 'feast' or 'sacrifice'. Here the former sense may apply, and includes the whole process from preparation to consumption. Cf. KTU 1.1 iv 28; 1.16 i 39-40; 1.20 i 1. The divine feast is the theological paradigm of the procedures of the cult, in which, with human personnel as the subjects, *dbḥ* has the specialized sense of 'perform a sacrifice'. Cf. Virolleaud's (1968: 549) remarks on the nuance of the vb in the present passage, and note Pardee's (1988a: 24-26) comments.

6. Ug. *mṣd*. See Loewenstamm (1971b). On the prosody, dividing *mṣd*, *ṣd* between the cola, already recognized by Virolleaud (1968: 546), see Margalit (1979-80: 73-77; he corrects *ṣd* to <*m*>*ṣd*), Pardee (1988a: 20, 23-24) and most recently Cathcart (1996: 2). Loewenstamm's (1969: 73) stichometry, dividing the cola at *bbth* | *mṣd ṣd*, followed by Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín (1975h: 109, 111) does a disservice to the prosody. The latter group, however, regard *mṣd*, *ṣd* as dittographic, and print {*mṣd*} *ṣd*. Both terms relate to hunting (√*ṣwd*), without specifying the quarry. Caquot (1989: 73) and others: 'venison' for *ṣd*. I see no problem with the hunting aspect here, so long as it is recognized that this is a feast in which the quarry has been brought back. Margalit's (1979–80: 79-80) anxiety (about

He cried:
'To the carving[8], gods[9]!
Eat, O gods, and drink!
Drink wi<ne> until satiety,
foaming wine[10] until intoxication!'[11]

hunting in a palace!), which leads him to propose an appeal to Akk. *ṣidītu*, Heb. *ṣēdâ*, 'travel provisions', is unnecessary. His further stricture (p. 94), that wild animals never feature in the cult, is answered on two grounds. Firstly that it is not true (the Eg. temple-lists enumerate wild animals in profusion, and Aqhat is exhorted to make an offering of his first hunting-quarry, *pr'm ṣdk*, in KTU 1.17 v 37 [and n. 87]), and secondly that this feast may as well be modelled on the royal hunt as on cultic practice. In addition, it may be that the gastronomic tradition on which the text draws is not the temple but the *marziḥu*. Cf. also Pardee's (1988a: 29-33) extensive discussion, in which he mentions boar and stag as victims offered to Adonis and Dionysos respectively, and as to royal menus mentions Solomon's in 1 Kgs 5.3, and those of various Assyrian kings. Anat and Athtart are also associated with the hunt respectively in KTU 1.17–1.19 and 1.92, which undoubtedly had a bearing on their sacrificial diet.

7. Or 'temple'. As commonly in the religious texts, the term *hkl* has both the nuances of temple and palace.

8. Ug. *qṣ*. Virolleaud (1968: 547, 549): 'to awaken' (Heb. *qyṣ*). Most 'the carving': e.g. de Moor (1969a: 168; 1987: 135) and Cathcart and Watson (1980: 37); √*qṣṣ*, 'to carve'. See Pope's (1972: 176-78) discussion of the term. 'To the banquet': Caquot (1989: 73). 'To the feast', n.: Pardee (1988a: 22); 'to partake', vb.: Pardee (1997c: 303).

9. Text *ṣḥ lqṣ ilm*. Anacrusis and first unit of a bicolon. Others treat as one narrative colon, with the direct speech beginning in the following colon, and referring to the gods in the 3rd p. Thus 'He called the gods to the banquet...'. But can the vb *yṣḥ* have the trans. sense of 'summon', with *ilm* as obj.? In all other Ug. instances, as far as I know, it is intrans. And the word order would be strange, even in verse, on this interpretation.

10. Ug. *trṯ*: cf. Heb. *tîrôš*: the first wine of the vintage, still fermenting and gaseous, and therefore having immediate effect on the consumer. This appears to locate the events in the autumn, as the new wine becomes available. However, *yn* || *trṯ* is perhaps a standard word-pair (if to be restored at KTU 1.5 iv 20 in addition to its occurrence here and at l. 16), and so not too much weight should be put on the usage. The present myth is concerned not so much to narrate some specific cultic situation (though this is not impossible, of course) as to represent a paradigm for intoxication and its cure.

11. Most other interpreters have these vbs in the 3 pl. indic. In accordance with above: Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín (1975h: 109) and Cathcart (1996: 2).

1.114 R 5 Yarih arched his back like a d[o]g[12];
he gathered up crumbs[13] beneath the tables[14].

(Any) god who recognized him
threw[15] him meat[16] from the joint.[17]

12. Ug. *y'db yrḫ gbh*. This has been construed in a variety of ways. The translation above follows that of Margalit (1979–80: 71). I take it that some gesture of Yarih, perhaps stretching, evokes the picture of a dog, and he easily slips into this role in view of the later significance of the dog's hair. What is usually construed as the possessive *-h* on *gbh* more convincingly relates back to the subj. *yrḫ*, than to an antecedent (*mṣd* || *ṣd*) six and five cola previously. Cf. Virolleaud (1968: 547): 'so he prepared its *yrḫ-gb*'; de Moor (1969a: 168, followed by Cathcart 1996: 2): 'Yariḫu prepared its back flesh'; Pope (1972: 172): 'he prepared and mixed his *tripe* (?)'; Cathcart and Watson (1980: 37): 'Yariḫ leaves his couch'; de Moor (1987: 135): 'Yarikhu put down its saddle-meat'; Pardee (1988a: 22; cf. 1997c: 303): 'Yariḫu prepares himself a cup'; and Caquot (1989: 74): 'Yarikh helped himself to a (piece of) spine'. The expression 'like a dog' goes better as a qualification of how Yarih stretches, and thus belongs in this colon; as a qualification of picking up crumbs or whatever (thus most) perhaps it performs a double duty. Pope (1972) cites some interesting iconographic evidence of the widespread dog-under-the-table motif, but they are generally in a funerary context, and therefore distinct from the *marziḫu* institution, which has no such intrinsic associations. Nor, incidentally, is there any hint in the present text of any sexual activity. All the excess is gastronomic. The interpretation according to which Yarih legitimately helps himself to the back of the roast runs counter to the indignation of the porter that he receives choice cuts from Anat and Athtart. His canine quality would seem to preclude him from any involvement *above* the table.

13. Ug. *yqṯqṯ*. Virolleaud (1968: 547, 549) translates 'hides (?)', but compares with Ar. *qaṯṯa*, 'to draw towards oneself'. De Moor (1969: 168): 'he tore it out', citing the same Ar. √, which he translates 'to drag, pull out'. Note Pope's (1972: 180) observations on this. He (p. 172) translates 'tapped', citing MHeb. and THeb. *qišqēš*, 'to knock, strike, strike'. Cathcart and Watson (1980: 37): 'moves about'; Caquot (1989: 74): 'he drags it (his joint)'. Pardee (1988a: 22): 'like a dog he fills it' (but how does a dog fill a cup?). Pardee (1997c: 303): 'like a dog he drags it (the cup)'. For the present sense, of gleaning, gathering up scraps, see n. 146 to KTU 1.2 iv 27. Cf. Heb. *qāšaš* I and II (hithpolel): 'glean', MHeb. *qašqēš*, 'move back and forth' (Loewenstamm 1969: 74; Margalit 1979–80: 82-83). We may alternatively translate 'he scavenged'.

14. Cf. Mk 7.28. But the apparent echo is probably fortuitous.

15. On the considerable range of nuances in the meaning for √*'db* see Pardee (1988a: 35-36) and *DLU*, 72-73. In l. 4 above ('arched') the underlying sense is 'to raise up', which has a technical cultic sense in KTU 1.23.54 (*'db*, n., 'offering'). The same sense as the present one occurs at ll. 10, 12, 13. See Cathcart and Watson (1980: 42).

But (any god) who did not recognize[18] him
hit him with a stick[19] beneath the table.[20]

At the call of[21] Athtart and Anat he approached.[22]

1.114 R 10 Athtart threw him a haunch[23],
and Anat a shoulder of meat[24].

16. *KTU*^{2} (p. 130 n. 1) points out that 'underneath *m* (of *lḥm*) parts of the original text are clearly visible: ×[[×]]*d mṣd*'. Cf. also n. 21.

17. The *d mṣd* of the previous n., construed as *m* + *ṣd*. If Yarih had his own joint, on some translations, further ones would be superfluous. See also at n. 12 (end). This supports the view that he was merely given scraps under the table. With El apparently as subj. de Moor (1969a: 168; cf. 1987: 135) takes *dyd'nn...<d mṣd>* of ll. 6-7 to mean 'under the tables he put down food for the god whom he knew'. Cf. Margalit (1979–80: 84-85).

18. 'Recognize' (√*yd'*) rather than 'know'. Presumably it was Yarih's canine form or behaviour which would fool some of the other gods. 'Favourable... unfavourable': Margalit (1979–80: 84). The fact that there were gods who did not recognize him precludes *il* in the preceding colon denoting El, since it is part of the contrast between two groups of gods. Cf. (Pardee 1988a: 44-45).

19. Ug. *ḫṭm*: the *-m* is adverbial (instrumental). Cf. Margalit (1979–80: 72 n. 13). Or perhaps 'on the nose' (rather: 'muzzle') according to Margalit (1979–80: 72 n. 13: text as above).

20. De Moor (1969: 168; 1987: 135) has Yarih, who prepares the meat (*gbh*), the subject of all the activity in ll. 4b-8. But the sequel, in which Athtart and Anat are rebuked for feeding a now unidentified dog, reads curiously.

21. The signs *bqr* appear in miniature beneath the *lm* of l. 8. Cf. *KTU*^{2}, n. 2. I accept Margalit's (1979-80: 86-90) view that the word should precede the following l. 9. He cites Ar. *qarqara*, 'bray (of camel)', and Heb. *qarqēr*, 'shout' in support. Reading *bqr'*, Spronk (1986: 199) treats it as a gloss on *ḫṭm*: 'with a rod'. See Pardee (1988a: 45-47).

22. Yarih, in the form of or behaving like a dog, must be the subj., because the vb is 3 m. sg. Discussion in Margalit (1979–80: 87). Virolleaud's (1968: 547) ''Aštart and Anat arrive' is impossible.

23. The precise sense of *nšb* is not yet clear, but its meaning as a butchery term is clear from KTU 4.247.18. See Cathcart (1987); Pardee (1988a: 50 and n. 216).

24. Ug. *bhm*. As a prep., 'at them' (supposedly 3 c. du.) the word-order is difficult even in verse, with all the contortions of Browning! I have accepted Margalit's (1979–80: 90) explanation of this as a n. Cf. Heb. *bᵉhēmâ*. He also cites KTU 1.19 ii 39 in support. The porter can now address the feasters at large, while still directing his ire specifically at the goddesses. Note Pardee's (1988a: 51) desire to do something useful with *bhm*. But he demurs at 'lamb' (from Margalit with earlier refs.) on syntactic and prosodic grounds. See also at l. 27 (and n. 45) below.

The porter of El's house[25] shouted:

'Look[26]!
Why have you[27] thrown a haunch to the dog[28],
(why) to the cur have you thrown a shoulder?'[29]

He shouted at El his father[30].

1.114 R 15 El summoned his drinking-companions;[31]

25. A priestly office in a temple. In the myth this character will be a minor god, who like the porter in *Macbeth* is officious in the exercise of his duties. How far the temple priesthood would see themselves as impersonating gods (as in Egypt, where they wore masks conforming to divine iconographic conventions for certain rituals) remains imponderable. Reshef is the 'porter' of Shapsh in KTU 1.78.

26. Ug. *pn*. Imper. of √*pny*, Virolleaud (1968: 550) and Margalit (1979–80: 97). This would require to be construed as a denom. on *pn*, 'face'. The normal Ug. for 'see' is √*ph*(*y*) (*UT*, 467 §19.2025). Pardee (1988a: 51, 53): 'lest...' with the porter's words a command to prevent the goddesses serving the dog. But it would be natural for goddesses of hunting to feed their dogs.

27. 'They...': Margalit (1979–80: 72).

28. Text *rlb*. Read *k*[*l*]*lb*. See discussion at Margalit (1979–80: 96-97).

29. Perhaps the rebuke is because choice cuts are being wasted on a dog? We have apparently advanced from the simile of Yarih behaving like a dog to a metaphor of him being one. At any rate, this dog is one of the gods. (Cf. *klbt ilm* at KTU 1.3 iii 45 and n. 52, and the problem of *klb ilnm* at KTU 1.19 i 10 and n. 183). The link with Yarih may not be fortuitous, since Gk Hekate, a lunar goddess, is also closely associated with dogs (West 1995: 201-10). Since she has oriental antecedents, we would expect similarities in the hinterland of Ugaritic belief, however tenuous the surviving evidence. See Pardee (1988a: 41-42).

30. Presumably the porter wants to complain that El should be so indulgent as to allow the goddesses to waste good food on dogs. As with the encounters between Anat and El, in which the goddess addresses him without inhibitions (KTU 1.3 v 20-31 and n. 72, 1.18 i 8-20 and nn. 129-30), this is not to be construed as weakness on El's part. He plays the indulgent *paterfamilias*, in the knowledge that his authority is ultimately beyond challenge. This is commonly represented as typical of a bankrupt (polytheistic) theology. On the contrary, it is the great strength of a polytheistic system (in so far as it is systematic), that it uses the realism associated with normal human discourse and social dynamics as the symbolic medium in which metaphysical problems, as well as social dissonances, are thrashed out and resolved.

31. The text is damaged. Virolleaud (1968: 547): *yṯb.il*[*b*(?)] *aṯrt* ('...Athirat'). Pope (1972: 171): *yṯb.il*[*b*(?)] (15) *aṯ*[*rh*] ('...[his pl]ace', parallel to *mr̄ḫ*). Similarly Margalit (1979–80: 98-101). Cathcart and Watson (1980: 36, 38): *yṯb.il*[*bn*] (15) *aṯ*[*rt*] ('...like a s[on of Athi]rat'). The form of the simile is odd, since El is presumably the father of 'the sons of Athirat'. Pardee (1988a: 14, 22, 54-55; 1997c:

El took his seat in his feasting house[32].

He drank wine to satiety,
new wine until intoxication.

El went off to his house;
he stumbled off[33] towards his dwelling[34];
Thukamun and Shanim[35] supported[36] him[37].

304 and n. 11): *yṯb.il.k*[*r*] (15) *aškr*[*h*], ('El sits down, he gathers [his] drinking [group]'). Cf. *KTU*^{2}. The putative *aškr* is related to √*škr*, 'become intoxicated' of ll. 4 and 16. My main objection to this (otherwise attractive) reconstruction is that it results in two main vbs in one colon. If it be read (with l. 15) as a tricolon (El sits down, | he gathers [his] drinking [group], | El sits in his feasting-house'), which solves this problem, it falls foul of the prosodic rules enunciated by Margalit (1979–80: 76), though these are not universally accepted. Note that Pardee's (1997c) translation has solved this problem: 'Ilu calls together (√*ṯb*) his drinking [group], | takes his seat (√*yṯb*) in his drinking club'. This reading, adopted here, is also accepted by Cathcart (1996: 3), though his translation needs revision. De Moor's (1984: 355-56) suggestion 'henbane', adopted by Spronk (1986: 199) is unnecessary. See Pardee's remark (1988a: 55). Margalit (1979–80: 98) reads both vbs as 'was presiding'.

32. Ug. *mrzḥ*. See Pope (1972: 190-94) for a general treatment of the institution. If in view of Pardee's (1988a: 56) comments we hesitate to identify the *marziḥu* as specifically El's, we might translate the final *-h* as directional, but this would in turn require a reappraisal of *yṯb*.

33. Ug. *yštql* surely invokes a falling motion. Št of √*ql*.

34. Ug. *ḥṭr* for *ḥẓr*. See de Moor 1969a: 172. Not *ḥẓr* on the tablet, as many transliterate it, including *KTU*^{2}.

35. Pardee (1988a: 59) hesitates to affirm the identification of this divine pair with the Kassite deities Shuqamuna and Shumaliya, on the grounds of the considerable distance between the latter two names. The problem is easily solved however if we accept Mironov's (1933: 143) etymology for *šumaliya*, as deriving from Skt. *su* + *mālya*, 'having a beautiful garland', an epithet of Uṣas the dawn-goddess. This has been paraphrased in the WS form *šanimu*, 'bright'. See Wyatt (1990a: 446-47). This may remain hypothetical, but it establishes a case. See also n. 39 at KTU 1.1 iii 24 for further discussion.

36. Note how the supporting action (√*'ms*) of his companions complements El's falling action (√*ql*) in the previous colon.

37. The image is rather unbecoming to a modern reader, but is an honourable one, given the presuppositions of the text. Thukamun and Shanim fulfil the duty incumbent on the righteous son (KTU 1.17 i 30-31 and parallels; see n. 37 *ad loc.*). While these deities do not even feature in the pantheon list of KTU 1.47 = 1.118 = RS 20.24, they appear, mentioned before El and Athirat, in KTU 1.65.4. Cf. also their mention in KTU 1.123.8: this text lists a number of deities in pairs. Their

A creeping monster[38] approached him[39],
1.114 R 20 with[40] horns and tail!
He floundered[41] in his (own[42]) faeces and urine:

position in KTU 1.40, 1.25, 1.34 and 1.43 (and putative position in missing parts of the text, involving a six-stage ritual, *qv.* above) as the immediate recipients of the sacrificial victim offered up in the atonement rites for the city is an indication of their considerable rank and theological importance. We do well not to reach too far-reaching conclusions on the importance of individual deities on the basis of one genre alone of texts.

38. Ug. *ḥby*. See Gordon (1985, 1986; seeing here a prototype of Satan); seen as a chthonian deity, but without a full endorsement of Gordon's view, by Xella (1995b). De Moor (1969: 169; 1987: 136), followed by Spronk (1986: 199 and n. 4), translates 'steward' (Eth. *ḥabi'*). He identifies the steward as 'a faun-like demon' (1987: 136 n. 10). See Cathcart and Watson (1980: 39-40) for the range of possible meanings of *ḥby*. Their suggestion that *ḥbl* be read is unconvincing, since the *y* is clear. But their alternative, *ḥb ḫḫ*, 'embracer of filth', is interesting (*y* and *ḫḫ* being identical in cuneiform). Pardee (1988a: 60-62), following on from suggestions by Liverani (1969: 339) and Xella (1977: 246 n. 33) wonders whether another candidate may be Eg. *ḥpy*, sc. Hapi, the deified Nile worshipped in the incarnation of the Apis bull. He would thus provide the necessary horns and the tail. He further suggests that we may have here an *alter ego* of Yarih, who in his canine form is similar to Anubis, the latter and Apis both being psychopomps. But while Mesopotamian moon-gods appear as bulls, the Eg. form does not, being an ibis or baboon as Thoth, and a child or even a falcon as Khons. Pardee concedes that we know little of the dissemination of the Apis-cult. The suggestion is intriguing but must at present remain conjectural. Cathcart (1996: 5) has a further interesting proposal, that *ḥby* is a scorpion.

39. Ug. *ngšnn*. Cathcart and Watson (1980: 36) translate as 'they met (*Ḥby*)' (which would have El, Thukamuna and Shanim as subj. of the vb.). Their alternative explanation (p. 41) of the √ would provide a viable translation as follows: 'A creeping monster oppressed him' (Heb., Aram. *nāgas*, instead of Heb. *nāgaš*, 'approach'). Cf. n. 79 at KTU 1.6 ii 21.

40. Ug. *b'l*, in its functional sense. Margalit's (1979–80: 72) introduction of Baal as an additional character, with his consequently different treatment of the sequel, is unnecessary.

41. Ug. *ylšn*. See Pope (1972: 196), followed by Cathcart and Watson (1980: 41). Or 'defiled himself'. The word is best taken, among a number of possibilities, to be a cognate of Ar. √*lšš*, occurring in the redupl. form *lašlaš*, 'to run to and fro in fear' (defaecating). De Moor (1969: 169; 1987: 136): 'blamed...scolded' (√*lšn*). 'Wallow': Xella (1977: 240). Further discussion in Pardee (1988a: 64). Cf. Cathcart's (1996: 3, 6) translation.

42. Many take it that the character who falls is El. But in whose faeces? His own, or the monster's? The obvious way to construe the syntax would be that it is

El fell down as though dead;
El was like those who go down into the underworld.[43]

Anat and Athtart went out hunting
[ ]
1.114 V 25 [ ][44]

Athtart and Anat [returned]
And they brought back meat[45] [ ]

When they had cured him, he awoke[46].

(This is) what needs to be put on his forehead[47]: dog-hair[48] and the knot of a vine[49] and its juice[50]. They should

El's, the suffix referring back to the subj. of the preceding vb. The further mention of El in the next colon (the next syntactic unit) would appear to confirm this. Xella (1995b) suggests that it is the latter's (though he is ambiguous). Pardee (1988a: 63-64) takes it that Hapi, the bull, strides through his (own) excreta. This may make more sense, and would also remove from El the stigma (which some are only too determined to place on him!) of being simply incontinent as well as drunk. But as Pardee concedes, 'there are two big "ifs"...' and he finally and reluctantly concludes that El has disgraced himself. For Cathcart (1996) it is the scorpion that 'defiles itself in its excrement and urine'.

43. De Moor (1969: 169; 1987: 136) takes these three cola to be a speech by 'the steward' (*ḥby*) who blames (*lšn*) El for his behaviour. (See n. 38.) There is no reason to interpret this reference to death as having any direct connection with funerary rites or a mortuary cult. If it is a wake (Cathcart and Watson 1980), it is one without a corpse, except in so far as when one is really drunk one feels like death. It sounds like a good description of too much alcohol! But it may give us some insight into the theological significance attributed to intoxication. It appears to have been interpreted as a mystical descent into the underworld, and the following ascent (on recovery) would perhaps be interpreted as a form of spiritual renewal. In the myth El himself establishes the paradigm.

44. An indeterminate number of lines is missing from the end of the recto and the beginning of the verso, perhaps about 12.

45. Ug. *bhm*, which I have translated as at l. 11 above. As 'with them' it is unconvincing.

46. Ug. *n'r*. See Margalit (1979–80: 113), who explains this as √*n'r*, 'shake up' or N stem from √'(w)r(r), 'awaken'. For the latter see Pardee (1988a: 67-68) and Cathcart (1996: 3).

47. Ug. *lṣb*, as at KTU 1.4 iv 28 etc. See Cathcart and Watson (1980: 40-41).

48. Lit. 'the hair of a dog'. This commonplace English expression has an ancient pedigree! Nowadays it means the further drink the alcoholic takes to reduce the hangover. It is probably not a reference to a real dog-hair, however, but to a plant of this name: Pope (1972: 199, citing Thompson 1949: 23) draws attention to

be applied together[51] with virgin[52] olive oil.[53]

Akk. *šêr kalbi* ('dog-hair'), a plant with medicinal properties, 'mixed with oil and taken internally for intestinal and urinary problems'. (Pardee [1988a: 68-71] cites numerous passages which deal with the ritual and medicinal use of real dogs' hairs.) No doubt some lateral thinking is afoot in this whole medical prescription, in which the effective word of the ritual, the preceding myth, alludes to a dog whose hair is now used metaphorically in the application of the herb. Thus also Pardee (1988a: 42, 69-70). The dog's further association with Yarih above may well have also had a bearing on the preparation of the medicine, which may have coincided with a particular phase of the moon. But the details of this can only remain conjectural.

49. Ug. *pqq*: Pope (1972: 199) excludes this from identification as Akk. *piqū*, *piqūtu*, 'colocynth', another medicinal herb, on philological grounds (the Akk. has a radical '). But some plant seems a likely candidate. Cathcart and Watson (1980: 43, 47): 'knot of a vine shoot' (perhaps related to MHeb. *peqeq*. cf. also Hos. 10.1, *gepen bôqēq*, 'luxuriant vine').

50. Ug. *šrh*. Pope (1972: 200) notes Sum. ŠE.RU.A (Akk. *šer'u*?), 'liquorice', but does not identify it with the present term. Cathcart and Watson (1980: 48) point to Num. 6.3, *mišrat ʿᵃnābîm*, 'juice of grapes'.

51. Ug. *aḥdh*. 'Together', sc. in an emulsion: cf. Pardee (1997c: 305 n. 26). 'At one gulp': Caquot (1989: 78 and n. 248). The term occurs in the application of medicines in the hippiatric texts (KTU 1.71.6, 8, 10, 25; 1.72.8, [10], [14], 20, 24, 35, 39; 1.85.6, 8, 11, [15], [22], [28], 32).

52. Ug. *ḫrpnt*. Following Loewenstamm (1969: 77) and Pope (1972: 201) rather than Margalit (1979–80: 116). Akk. *ḫarpiš*, 'early' (<*ḫarāpu*, 'be early'). Cf. Caquot 1989: 78 n. 247.

53. Xella (1977: 249) calls this a 'therapeutic and ritual appendix'. While it is clearly an independent composition, belonging to a genre of medical prescription, it is probably the *raison d'être* for the writing of the tablet, which is 'applied mythology', here in a medical setting, and may be compared with similar applications, such as KTU 1.23, famine, KTU 1.24, weddings, KTU 1.100, and probably KTU 1.107, snakebite, and KTU 1.124, an obscure ailment. The last three are also medical, and illustrate the way in which the boundaries of autonomous disciplines and skills have changed. Medicine, psychiatry, various aspects of law and order (particularly moral issues), all aspects of prognostication, oath-taking and many elements of political life involving ritual activity were all priestly functions. The final three lines were formerly interpreted quite differently. See, e.g., Virolleaud (1968: 551) and de Moor (1969a: 169). An older mode of interpretation is typified in Margalit's (1979–80: 72) translation of the final section: 'Let ḫš-leaves be placed on his mouth, massage the heart and head, (as well as) the navel-knot and its 'cord'; together with this let him drink pure olive-oil', and Cathcart and Watson's (1980: 38) version: 'What the troubled one should put on his forehead, settling heart and head: the knot of a vine shoot and its centre he should put, together with autumnal olive juice'. For some further translation suggestions see Watson (1990).

KTU 1.117: The Plea for a House for Baal

(KTU 1.117 = RS 24.263)

Select Bibliography
Herdner 1978, 64-67; Pardee 1988a: 257-60.

A small bottom right-hand-corner fragment of a scribal exercise tablet, less than half a tablet-width, with an excerpt from the formulaic language of KTU 1.3 v 33-41 (see nn. 73, 74 *ad loc.*), 1.4 i 4-16, iv 45-55 (see n. 131 *ad loc.*), and a further passage thus far unparalleled. Lines are scored unevenly across the tablet between each line of text as with KTU 1.101 and 1.108 above (representation here is schematic).

1.117 R 1 [ ]
We should all bring his chalice,

[we should all bring his cup.]

[Groaning he cries to Bull] El his father,

---

to El the ki[ng who begot him.]

[He cries to Athirat] and her sons,

---

to the goddess [and the band of her kinsmen:]

['There is no] house for Baal like the gods,

1.117 lower edge 5 [nor dwelling like the sons of Athirat.]

[E]l [has a home],

---

his sons have shelters;

[The Great Lady-who-tramples-Yam has a home,]

[Pid]ray daughter of Light [has a home]

	[Taliy daughter of Shower has a shelter.]
	[ ] until death dwelling [ ]
	[ ] the mountain of dew [ ]
	[ ] I shall flee,
	like a [ ]
	[ ]'
1.117 V 10	And Pidray replied:
	'[ ] your dwelling...'

KTU 1.119: The Ritual Calendar for the Month of Ibaalat and Another Month and a Prayer for Ugarit Under Siege

(KTU 1.119 = RS 24.266)

Select Bibliography

Herdner 1972, 1978: 31-39; Xella 1978b, 1981: 25-34; Saracino 1983a, 1983b; de Moor 1987: 171-74; Parker 1989: 70-72; de Tarragon 1989: 206-11; del Olmo 1989b, 1992a: 197-205; Pardee 1993b: 213-18, 1997c: 283-85, 2000: 661-85; Avishur 1994: 253-76; Watson 1996a.

This tablet, of which perhaps the bottom third is missing, consists of an offering-list on the recto and on the verso down to l. 25, concluding with a votive prayer to Baal used in time of siege. Herdner (1978: 31-33) shows a number of faint horizontal lines traced either wholly or partly across. These are hardly visible on the recto owing to the deterioration of the surface. Those on the verso are not marked here. Herdner (1972: 696) expresses some surprise at the nationalist sentiment of the prayer which closes the text in so cosmopolitan a community as Ugarit. But pride in citizenship undoubtedly generated a sense of corporate identity in proportion to Ugarit's sense of autonomy in the never-ending diplomatic game of playing off one rival superpower against the other. The prayer which concludes this text is thus far unparalleled in Ugaritic literature, but as a liturgical composition bears a resemblance to the Hebrew Psalms.

1.119 R 1 In the month of Ibaalat[1], on the seventh day, a ram to Baal of Ugarit[?2] [ ] and (in[3]) the temple of Baal of

1. Ug. *ib'lt*. This month-name was hitherto unattested in Ug. It appears in Akk. in RS 25.455A + B as *ib-a-la-ti*. Xella (1981: 27-28) identifies it with the Phoen. month of *p'lt*. De Moor (1987: 171 n. 1) opines that, meaning 'Where-is-the-Mistress?', it possibly denotes 'the month in which 'Anatu/'Athtartu's descent into the Nether world was commemorated'. De Jong and van Soldt (1987–88: 69-71) place the month as the sixth, in January–February, while Pardee (1997c: 283 n. 2) places it in December–January, the time of the winter solstice.

2. The text reads *b'l r'kt*, the second word a *hapax*, according to *KTU*^{2} (*KTU*^{1} corrected to *'rkt*). *KTU*^{2} (p. 134 n. 2) suggesting *ugrt* as an alternative reading, following the discussion by del Olmo (1992a: 199 and n. 10): it is provisional. Del Olmo explains it by haplography, and notes other misspellings on the tablet. He writes it here as <*ug*>*rt*. Cf. l. 3. Xella (1981: 26, 28): 'buildings (?)', reading *'rkt*,

Ugarit [ ] a ram [ ]. At sunset[4] the king is desacralized[5].

1.119 R 5 On the seventeenth the king shall wash himself thoroughly[6]. A heifer (to) the sanctuary of El[7]; a heifer to the Baals[8]; a heifer to the Divine Assistant[9]. Two ewes and

with the suggestion that it is related to the form *b'l 'rkm* of KTU 1.105.17-18 (in *KTU*[2]; *KTU*[1] ll. 3-4). Xella (1981: 36) translates this as 'Baal of the buildings', while del Olmo (1992a: 166 and n. 94) translates it as '(for) Baal, two *'rk-m*', explaining the term with reference to de Moor (1970a: 318) 'two loaves of layer-bread'. De Moor (1987: 172), reading (de Moor and Spronk 1987: 70) *r'kt.šl*[ ], begins a new sense-unit with the word, (tentatively) 'biscuits, a ram for [ ]'. De Tarragon (1989: 207): 'a ram for Baal in *'rkt*-offerings', which introduces an unknown category of offering. Pardee (1997c: 283 and n. 3) takes *r'kt* as an unexplained divine epithet, 'apparently a hypostasis of Baal'. The tablet surface is in such a state that no proposed reading remains above suspicion. The present translation, following del Olmo's suggestion, is provisional. All things being equal, however, since the text is concerned primarily with the patron deity of Ugarit, who certainly appears four more times in ll. 3, 9-10, 12, 21-22, and is evidently the subject of the prayer of ll. 26-36, the gratuitous introduction of an entirely different, and hitherto unattested, form of the deity in l. 2 is improbable.

3. Text *bt*. Perhaps haplography for *bbt*. In any case some prep. value is required.

4. Ug. *'rb špš*. Cf. *ṣbu špš* at KTU 1.41.42, 47, 1.87.51 (the last two also *'rb*) with the same sense.

5. Cf. Pardee (1993b: 214): 'is clear of further cultic obligations'. De Moor (1987: 172) construes this quite differently: '(Invoke) the sunset and the host of Maliku'.

6. The same phrase occurs at KTU 1.41.[3]; 1.46.10, etc. (*CPU*, I 1023).

7. Ug. *qdš il*. Cf. *bt il* at l. 14 and n. 24. De Tarragon (1989: 207): 'the sanctuary of the god'. De Moor (1987: 172) and Pardee (1997c: 284): 'the sanctuary of Ilu'. Schaeffer (1972: 697) observed that the tablet 'comes from the archive of a priest attached to the cult of El'. (Find spot South Acropolis, 'cella aux tablettes' p.t. 3751 at 3m0: Bordreuil and Pardee 1989: 301.) Contrast del Olmo (1992a: 205), who writes that 'the ritual turns out to be predominantly "baalish" in terms of its intended recipient...'.

8. The seven Baals of the pantheon-lists (KTU 1.47.5-12 and parallels) rather than sg. with encl. Thus de Tarragon (1989: 207 n. 190 '...or his statues'). Cf. Xella 1981: 29. Pardee (1997c: 284): 'the Ba'lu(-deities)'.

9. On Ug. *ǵlm* see n. 99 to KTU 1.2 i 13, n. 30 to KTU 1.169.10, and Xella (1981: 29-30). The present instance and that of *ǵlmtm* in l. 8 (next n.) raise problems of identification. I have given the translation 'Divine Assistant' here (capitals because it is a specific god, not a generic term) in accordance with my discussion above. I take it to be a god of the third rank, such as one of the messenger gods who

a h<ei>fer to the Sacred Brides[10], in the house of sacrifice[11] he[12] will slaughter[13]; and there shall be burnt[14] in
1.119 R 10 the altar-room[15] of Baal of U[!]garit[16] a lamb and a feral

appear in the myths (Yam's assistants, KTU 1.2 i 13-35, Baal's assistants [Gupan and Ugar], KTU 1.3 iii 8-32, iv 5-20; Athirat's [Qadesh-and-Amurr], KTU 1.3 vi 10-25), but hardly Baal himself as for de Moor (1987: 162 and n. 46, 172). But the specific identity of the deity remains unclear.

10. Ug. *ǵlmtm*. The term is du., but it is unnecessary to state this in translation, if my proposed identification is tenable. The sg. term denotes a bride in a sacred marriage tradition (as in KTU 1.24.7), or a royal bride who is mythologically represented in this form (as in KTU 1.15 ii 22). The term used of a goddess, receiving an offering, occurs in KTU 1.39.19, 1.41.25 (= 1.87.27), 1.123.19. 1.139.9 and 1.148.34. The vocabulary KTU 9.3 iii 15 (no text in *KTU*^{2}; see *CPU*, II 1647) may identify *ḫulmatum* with Arṣum (= Arsiy?). The du. usage suggests that avatars of Athirat and Rahmay, who appear as El's brides in KTU 1.23, may be the figures to whom the present term refers. A translation such as 'lad' and 'lasses' for the two terms here is scarcely adequate when they denote deities. Xella (1981: 26) construes the term with the following word *bt*: '... for the two *ǵlmt* of the temple'. Note discussion and further refs. on the two terms *ǵlm* and *ǵlmtm* in de Tarragon (1989: 207 n. 191). Herdner (1978: 32) wonders whether the terms denoted temple personnel. On this understanding we should read 'for...' rather than 'to...' in each case. Cf. *ǵlmt* as 'darkness' n. 171 at KTU 1.4 vii 54 (= 1.8.7). See also *ǵlmt* I and II, *DLU*, 157.

11. Ug. *ṯ'y*. See n. 131 to KTU 1.6 vi 57. Taken by Xella (1989: 26) as the subj. of the following vb: 'the celebrant will offer a sacrifice'. De Moor (1987: 172): 'the house of the officiant shall sacrifice' explained (with ref. to p. 99 n. 483) as the king (Niqmad II) represented by the high priest. Now rather Niqmad III–IV.

12. Presumably the king. Thus de Tarragon (1989: 207). 'The officiant': de Moor (1987: 172).

13. Or: 'will sacrifice'.

14. Ug. (*w*)*tnrr*. The form is *hapax*. Perhaps √*nyr* (cf. Heb. √*nwr*) in D form, 'burn (in fire)'. Thus Herdner (1978: 33), followed by Xella (1981: 26, 30-31): 'and the fire is lit' (3 f. sg.); de Moor (1987: 172): 'and roast' (3 f. sg. with 'the house of the officiant' as subj.); del Olmo (1992a: 200-201): 'and they will be burnt' (3 f. pl.). On the same √, Pardee (1997c: 284) translates: 'you shall illumine' (2 sg.).

15. Ug. *'d*. The term occurs in KTU 1.23.12, where I have translated it 'throne-dais' on the basis of its use at KTU 1.16 vi 22, where it is parallel to *ksi*. Del Olmo (1992: 200): 'in the "testimonial"'; Pardee (1997c: 284 and n. 10): 'the 'D-room'. Xella (1981: 26) and de Moor (1987: 172): 'behind', which is the sense of *b'd* at KTU 1.16 vi 49 (*b'd kslk*: 'behind your back'). Is the *'d* perhaps the room in the temple where the cult-image resides? Its name suggests a raised platform of some kind. The main altar in the Baal temple was in the courtyard at the south end. As del Olmo suggests, the vb *tnrr* may allude to a holocaust.

pigeon as an oblation[17].
On the eighteenth (day) of Ibaalat an ox for the tower[?18] of Baal of Ugarit: both a flame-offering[19] and[20] a wave-offering[21] (are to be made)[22]. The king shall indeed[23] sacrifice in the temple of El[24] (offering) a lung[25] to

16. Text *lgrt*.

17. Ug. *ṯ'*. The precise nuance is elusive. See n. 11 above and n. 131 at KTU 1.6 vi 57 (*ṯ'y*: 'sacrificer'), n. 115 at 14 iv 37 (*ṯ'*: 'votary') and n. 10 at KTU 1.169.2 (*ṯ'y*: 'exorcist'). Following Xella (1981: 26): 'by way of offering' and de Moor (1987: 172): 'as an oblation'. De Tarragon (1989: 207): 'as a *ṯ'y*-offering'. Del Olmo (1992a: 200): 'in honour of the "hero"'. But it is difficult to envisage who this might be. The rough Ugaritic equivalent to the Gk hero was the *rpu*. See n. 9 at KTU 1.161.2. Perhaps an alternative is 'on behalf of the sacrificial personnel'.

18. Text *mdgl*, while 'tower' is *mgdl*. Pardee's (1997c: 284 n. 11) caution is admirable. Others treat as metathesis and translate as 'tower'. Wilfred Watson draws my attention to Akk. *dagālu*, 'look-out'; *madgaltu* 'watch-tower'. Is *mgdl* a metath. on *mdgl*? The idea of the tower of the temple as recipient of an offering seems curious, until we realize that temples were widely deified in the ancient world. The towers of the Baal and Dagan temples at Ugarit were of particular significance to sailors, since they formed a pair of beacons guiding ships between the shoals into the harbour at Minet el Beida. Such a cult would perhaps be associated in particular with the votive offering of anchors in the Baal temple. See discussion and references in Frost (1991). De Tarragon (1989: 208, n. 194) draws attention to the temple-tower which Keret ascends in KTU 1.14 ii 20.

19. Ug. *urm*. De Tarragon (1989: 208) : 'at daybreak'. The use of *u*...*u* (next note) makes this an awkward interpretation. At KTU 1.41.[17] the adv. expression *burm* appears to mean 'midday'. See n. 24 *ad loc*.

20. 'Both...and': Ug. *u*...*u*. It can also mean 'either...or', but the text, which is prescriptive, is hardly likely to be providing alternatives. See *UT*, 353 §19.108.

21. Ug. *šnpt*. This has been construed as etymologically identical to Heb. *tenûpâ* (the Hiph. stem used of the vb in Heb., the Š-stem here). 'Wave-offering', 'elevation-offering': Milgrom (1972), Xella (1981: 26, 31), de Moor (1987: 172) and del Olmo (1995: 45). Cf. Lev. 7.30, 8.29 etc. See however Watson (1995b: 544) for the suggestion that it is borrowed from Hitt. *šnpt*, 'community(?) offering', from Hitt. *šipand-*, 'to offer'. This may be preferable (though I have followed the first option here) because we would expect a pt. form **mšnpt*.

22. The syntax is uncertain, because some sections of the text appear to be complete sentences, while others are just lists of items.

23. Ug. *l*. 'Not': de Moor (1987: 172). It is unlikely however that the text would list activities *not* to be carried out.

24. Ug. *bt il*. El's temple according to de Moor (1987: 172) and Pardee (1997c: 284). This temple has not been identified, unless the 'temple aux rhytons' is it. Or:

1.119 R 15 Ish[hara[26] and], a lung to Baal [of Ugarit?]...
and a donkey[27] to [ ]
[ ]

(An uncertain number of lines missing)

1.119 V [ ]
1.119 V 20 On the previous day[28] [the king] is to hono[ur] On the fourth (day), (two?) birds[29]. On the fifth (day), (two?) birds[30] and a liver and a ram as a holocaust[31] to Baal of Ugarit in (his) temple. On the seventh (day) the purifiers[32] shall approach[33]. At sunset the king shall be

'the temple of the god' (sc. of Baal). Cf. n. 7. See also n. 29 to KTU 1.3 ii 17 and nn. 44, 45 to 1.41.[38].

25. Ug. *npš*. De Moor (1987: 172): 'throat'; Pardee (1997c: 284): 'neck'. Perhaps the whole respiratory system, lungs, bronchi and trachea, would be offered as a unit. 'Entrails': del Olmo (1992a: 201).

26. A Hurrian goddess, if the restoration is correct, appearing as *ušḫry* in KTU 1.47.24 = 1.118.23, vocalized ^{d}Išḫara in the Akk. text RS 20.24.23.

27. See n. 17 to KTU 1.40.26. A donkey-sacrifice appears to be a special occasion: there on a day of atonement, here in time of political crisis.

28. This section, with its subsequent references to the fourth and fifth days, has the appearance of dealing with a month other than Ibaalat.

29. Ug. *'ṣrmm*. The form is curious. Herdner (1978: 34), Xella (1981: 27), de Moor (1987: 173) and del Olmo (1992a: 202), 'two birds'. De Tarragon (1989: 208) and Pardee (1997c: 284) translate as pl., the latter (n. 18) discussing the form, which is usually *'ṣrm* in the du. (e.g. KTU 1.87.29, 39), with perhaps an emphatic pl. indicator in the final *-m*. We should certainly expect a pl. to be qualified with a specific number, as with '[th]ree birds' ([*t*]*lt* *'ṣrm*), KTU 1.48.3, or 'four birds' (*arb' 'ṣrm*), KTU 1.48.18.

30. *KTU*^{2} *'ṣrmm*. Most read thus. De Moor (1987: 173) and del Olmo (1992a: 202): *š*l*mm*: 'as a peace-offering(?)'.

31. Herdner (1978: 34-35) reads *šš*r*[*p*]; *KTU*^{2} reads *šš*rt*. Neither is certain. In terms of context Herdner's reading, accepted by Pardee (1997c: 284), followed here, and taken to be two words, (*w*)*š* + *šr*p, is more plausible than Xella's (1981: 32) comparison with KTU 4.341.1-2, where *šš*rt ḫrṣ ṯqlm kbd* means 'a chain of gold, two heavy shekels (in weight)'. This view has been adopted by de Moor (1987: 173) and del Olmo (1992a: 203). The idea of a gold votive offering is not impossible, but appears anomalous in a list of blood-sacrifices.

32. Ug. *mḫllm*. Thus de Moor (1987: 173) and Pardee (1997c: 284). Hardly 'the profane' (Xella 1981:27, 32-33), though de Tarragon's (1989: 209) and del Olmo's (1992a: 203) view is tenable: 'those who desacralize'. Another possibility would be

desacralized. Here is the oil of well-being (for)
Baal. A libation for the queen[34].

Here begins (the liturgy)[35]:

If[36] a strong one attacks your gates[37],
a warrior your walls,

raise your eyes to Baal (saying):

'O Baal[38]!
If you will drive the strong one from our gates,
the warrior from our walls[39],

a bull[40], O Baal, we shall dedicate[41],
a vow[42], Baal, we shall fulfil:

to see them as 'pipers' (cf. Heb. √*ḥll* II, Pi., 'play the pipe': the present stem is D). Music would have played an important part in the cult.

33. Ug. *tdn*. Thus Herdner (1978: 35); *DLU* 135, *dny* (Ar. *danā*); Pardee (1997c: 284): 'you shall bring near'. De Moor (1987: 119): 'shall judge'; del Olmo (1992a: 203): 'shall proclaim'.

34. Herdner (1978: 34) reads *mlkm*, and has been followed by most commentators (e.g. Pardee 1997c: 284). De Moor (1987: 173: 'the former kingship') and del Olmo (1992a: 203: 'primordial royalty') have in mind the dynastic god(s) Malik (see KTU 1.47.33 and parallels). Xella (1981: 26) reads *mlkt*, and a colour slide, showing that the end of the putative *-m* is missing (the horizontal stroke is followed by a section where the surface is entirely lost), supports this as a reasonable alternative meaning. Since other routine cultic lists do not involve past kings (contrast KTU 1.161), I think Xella's reading is to be preferred.

35. Ug. *rišyt*. Lit. 'beginning'. Cf. Xella (1981: 27): 'Beginning (of the recitation)'.

36. Ug. *k*. Or 'when', 'whenever'.

37. Ug. *ṯgrkm*. This may refer to one gate or more.

38. Ug. *yb'lm*. Avishur (1994: 259) explains the form as *b'l* with two voc. elements, the initial *y-* and the final *-m*. Anacrusis: Watson (1996b: 27). He calls the *-m* a focus-marker.

39. 'Our gates...our walls' (Ug. *ṯgrny...ḥmytny*). Herdner (1972: 695-96) draws attention to the 1 p. du. suffix *-ny*. We should expect a pl. form. She explains this as referring to the worshippers on the one hand, and Baal on the other. They share the ownership of the city.

40. Though *ibr* is sg., Dupont-Sommer (1972: 699) and Herdner (1978: 37) are perhaps right to understand this as collective, given the crisis.

41. Ug. *nšqdš*: lit. 'sanctify'.

42. *nḏr* (√*nḏr*) instead of the more common *ndr*. Cf. Dijkstra and de Moor (1975: 172-73). Pl.: de Moor (1987: 173).

a male animal[43], Baal, we shall dedicate,
a propitiation[44] we shall fulfil,
a feast, Baal, we shall prepare.

We shall go up to the sanctuary of Baal[45],
we shall walk in the paths of the temple of Baal[46].'

Then Baal will listen to your prayer[47]:
1.119 V 35 he will drive the strong one from your gates,
the warrior from your walls...[48]

43. A crux. Herdner (1972: 694, 696-97; 1978: 33, 35, 37) proposes [*b*]*kr* for the second word in l. 31, which would constitute, she argues, the first evidence from Ugarit of child-sacrifice in extreme circumstances. Cf. 2 Kgs. 3.27; 16.3; 17.17; 21.6; 23.10; Mic. 6.7; Jer. 7.31. She treats [*b*]*kr* as sg. in the first article, but pl. in the second. *KTU*[1] reads [ ]kr. Xella (1978b; 1981: 26) reads [*d*]*kr*, and this has been widely accepted since (cf. *KTU*[2]) *pace* Margalit, de Moor and Avishur. For a general (negative) assessment of the Ug. evidence see Heider (1985: 144-47). The tablet itself is of no help in determining the reading, because a plaque is missing from the surface where the putative **b* or **d* should be. Even *dkr*, 'male', leaves problems unresolved, for as Heider points out the normal Ug. form is *ḏkr* (cf. Heb. *zkr*, Ar. *ḏkr*). The following still maintain the 'first-born' interpretation. Margalit (1983c: 364 n. 20, also reading *ḥtk* for *ḥtp* in l. 32. De Moor (1987: 174) has 'the firstlings of Ba'lu', reading (de Moor and Spronk 1987: 70) *bkr* with Herdner. He cites KTU 1.43.19, where in de Moor and Spronk (1987: 69) the text is read *dkr*, but in de Moor (1987: 170) he reads '[first]lings'. Avishur (1994: 255, 260-61): 'a first-born'. The case for the first-born is unproven rather than impossible, and would gain plausibility with further supporting evidence from Ugarit.

44. Ug. *ḥtp*. This is the Eg. term for 'propitiation' rather than 'booty' as read by Herdner (1972: 695). De Moor (1987: 174 n. 21) draws attention to Spalinger (1978) and Boyd (1986). Avishur (1994: 261, with refs.) also notes Akk. *ḫitpu*, 'a type of sacrifice'. *DLU*, 184.

45. The formula is constr. and gen. (all obj. of the vb) or obj. of the vb followed by voc., as observed by Herdner (1972: 695).

46. Evidently a reference to a cultic procession up through the city to the temple. Avishur (1994: 266) notes that Baal is invoked by name seven times in the body of the 'psalm' (ll. 28-33). Is this perhaps intended to incorporate all seven hypostases of the pantheon list (KTU 1.47 and parallels)?

47. Ug. *ṣltkm*. √*ṣly*. Herdner (1972: 695) cites Akk. *ṣalû*, 'to pray', *ṣelîtu*, 'prayer'.

48. The final bicolon forms an *inclusio* with the similar structure beginning the psalm (ll. 26-27), though it is not part of the cited text: Watson (1996b: 27-28). Pardee (1997c: 285 n. 26) notes that this is the last line of the text, though with a corner missing there may have been a brief conclusion.

KTU 1.124: A Medical Text based on an Oracle Tradition

(KTU 1.124 = RS 24.272)

Select Bibliography
Virolleaud 1968: 563-64; de Moor 1970b: 303-305; Xella 1981: 174-77; Pardee 1983, 1988a: 179-92; Spronk 1986: 193-96; Caquot 1989: 119-23; Dietrich and Loretz 1988: 329-31, 1990: 205-40; Tropper 1989: 151-56; del Olmo, 1992a: 208-11, 1992b.

I have translated the narrative elements of this text as past, suggesting that it is a mythic account, serving as the paradigm for a healing ritual. Ditan(u), the eponymous ancestor of the Ugaritic royal dynasty (see KTU 1.161) here serves as a healing god, perhaps indicating something of the pastoral role of the *Rpum* ('saviours', 'healers'), and providing instruction on medical procedure. Other texts of this genre (KTU 1.100, 1.114) combine ritual and practical measures. The present text deals entirely in the use of votive offerings. Cf. KTU 1.107 and 1.169 which rely on invocation of the gods.

1.124 1 When the lord of the great gods[1] came to Ditan[2], he[3] asked concerning the diagnosis[4] of the child.

1. Ug. *adn ilm rbm*. Or: 'many gods'. Cf. n. 1 to KTU 1.107.2. Schmidt (1994: 79) draws attention to the problem involved in identifying *adn ilm rbm* with El or Baal, as it involves a greater god consulting a lesser. On the other hand such a narrative reflects and perpetuates the enormous prestige of the eponym of the royal line. De Moor (1970b: 304) wonders whether the god may be Yam, but reserves judgment.

2. Cf. the Ditan of KTU 1.15 iii 4 (and n. 153) and the Didan of KTU 1.161.[3], 10, and nn.12, 21. The present person is not necessarily the legendary figure (de Moor [1970b: 303] takes it to be an ordinary PN). But I have supposed this to be the case, given the nature of the dialogue between deity and Ditan. The form *ddn* also appears, perhaps as the recipient of an offering, in the sacrificial text KTU 1.171.2 (miscited as KTU 1.174.2 in *CPU*, I 599) and in the PN *bn ddn* at KTU 4.760.5.

3. 'He' appears at first glance to be Ditan, acting on behalf of a third person, who consults the gods by way of Ditan (the royal ancestor) as a medium. See discussion in Caquot (1989: 121 n. 373). However, I take it to be the 'lord of the great gods' (El?), because the syntax of the third line (n. 5 below) requires it, who consults Ditan (now long dead). On this person see KTU 1.15 iii 4. Cf. Pardee's

Ditan answered him[5]:
1.124 5 'Reply:
"Take a [bag of myrrh[6]] and place it [in Horon's[7] temple[7]].
Take a container of new my[rrh] and place it in Baal's temple.
Take a wooden figurine[8] and place it in the temple[9].
1.124 10 And her disease will go away.[10]"'
And your messenger came to Ditan:
he accepted the diagnosis.

---

translation, (1988: 183). Has Ditan become the physician of the gods? It is not that El requires assistance, but that he is apparently checking that Ditan is fulfilling his duty, delegated to him in this role. We should not expect a monolithic systematic theology here. In a medical context, the specialist (the priest-physician) would naturally accord his own patron deity, here apparently Ditan, a particularly prestigious status.

4. Ug. *mṯpẓ* (= *mṯpṭ* ; cf. Heb. *mišpāṭ*). The term is forensic ('judgment', 'decision'), but here presumably has a quasi-medical sense, reflected in my translation. 'Oracular decision': de Moor (1970b: 304).

5. This is certainly what the text says, as the obj. suff. indicates. Thus Pardee (1988a: 183) and Dietrich and Loretz (1990: 212).

6. The text (read now as *nad.mr*, contrast *KTU*[1] with *KTU*[2]), Pardee (1988a: 181 etc.) lies along the top of a gap and is uncertain. As a 'healer' or 'saviour' (*rpu*) Ditan (the eponym of the assembly in KTU 1.161) instructs El on how to proceed.

7. As previous note. Here Pardee's transcription and drawing are more reticent than his translation. Horon, if to be read, is evidently, as a chthonian god, concerned with necromantic practice. See n. 25 to KTU 1.100.58. *KTU*[2]: [b]t.ḥrn (all in Rom.). In (1983: 131), Pardee reads l. 6 as 'the house of 'Anat (or 'Aṯtart, or: 'Aṯirat)'.

8. Ug. *bnt*. 'Figurine': Xella (1981: 175). An object of tamarisk-wood according to Dietrich and Loretz (1990: 218). Cf. del Olmo (1992a: 210 n. 63). Cf. n. 15 to KTU 1.3 ii 2. Another term for tamarisk (*'r'r*), though this may mean 'juniper', is used in KTU 1.100.64-65 in a snake-bite ritual.

9. Or: 'palace' (thus Dietrich and Loretz 1990: 212; del Olmo 1992a: 210), thus distinguishing it from the temples already mentioned. Or perhaps simply 'house', if this ritual is democratically observed. Or has a DN been omitted, so that it should read, on the previous pattern, 'in <DN>'s temple'?

10. Text uncertain. Pardee (1988a: 180), Dietrich and Loretz (1990: 211) and *KTU*[2]: *pr'* (Ug., Heb. √) 'send away, loose'. *KTU*[1] and Xella (1981: 174, 176): *pk* (Syr. 'destroy'). Del Olmo (1992a: 210; 1992b: 190): *prt* (Ug., Heb.√*prr* I), 'disappear'. The first is to be preferred.

And Ditan answered him:

1.124 15 'Let the house[11] be cleaned: no more fish and no more dog[12]!

lower edge Then afterwards there will be no illness.'

11. Ug. *btn* (Heb. *bîtān*). Xella (1981: 174) corrects to *bnt*, 'figurine'.
12. It is not clear whether these are merely present, or on the menu.

KTU 1.133: A Mythological Fragment concerning Mot

(KTU 1.133 = RS 24.293)

Select Bibliography

Virolleaud 1968: 559-61; de Moor 1969a: 184-88; Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín; 1975a: 536-39, 1991; Pardee 1988a: 153-64; M.S. Smith in Parker 1997: 177-79.

A scribal exercise. Lines 1-11 are closely related to KTU 1.5 i 12-22, though they diverge from it in detail.

1.133 R 1 And divine Mot replied:

'My appetite is the appetite of the lion in the wasteland,
1.133 R 5 and the appetite of the shark in the sea[1].

It frequents pools like wild bulls,
or the spring as the hind longs for it[2].

1.133 R 10 ...[3] and Nahar has filled my cup,
if my seven portions are on the plate.

---

lower edge [ ] Seventy thousand[4] [ ] are the clan...
...gazelles, bull(s).

1.133 V 15 [ ] the son of El, Mot,...
and the Beloved of El, the hero,
against the stone was strong[7],

and the Prince[5] was afraid[6]...

1. See n. 11 to KTU 1.5 i 14-16. The text here would appear to preclude my proposal for an alternative reading of the bicolon, *if its reading is to be preferred.* However, as can be seen in Pardee's (1988a: 158) parallel presentation of the two texts, the differences are considerable, and so this is not necessarily to be taken as the norm to which the other version should be made to conform. The word *hm* appears five times in KTU 1.5 i 11-22, but only three times here, and with only two correspondances (KTU 1.133.9-11 a reversed form of KTU 1.5 i 20-22).

2. Or: 'as a herd of hinds' (*k* + *ḏd*)? I have rejected this solution above, at n. 15 to KTU 1.5 i 17. Cf. *kḏd ad loc.*, where many authorities read as the equivalent of *kšd*, (KTU 1.5 i 16). This is a school exercise.

3. Text reads *mt* here, but it is hard to see what sense it makes. Absent from KTU 1.5 i 21.

4. Ug. *šb' rbt.* Or: 'satisfy...great...'?

5. Baal?

6. Cf. n. 30 to KTU 1.92.31.

KTU 1.148: A Compendium of Ritual Lists

(KTU 1.148 = RS 24.643)

Select Bibliography
Virolleaud 1968: 579-84; de Moor 1970b: 306-12; Caquot 1989: 224-28; Xella 1981: 91-100; del Olmo 1992a: 88-94; Pardee 1992, 2000: 779-806, 2001a: 39-48.

This ritual text is of interest in that its order of the gods corresponds to the 'canonical' pantheon list of KTU 1.47 and parallels. This suggests that the lists are not merely arbitrary in order. Furthermore, the text falls into five distinct parts, and the same order is observed throughout. The text is written on the recto on the width of the tablet, continuing on the verso on its length (see photographs, Pardee 1992: 154).

1.148 R 1 Sacrifices of Saphon[1]: [the god of the ancestor an ox and a ram[2]];
[I] El an ox and a ram; [Dagan an ox and a ram; Baal of Saphon an ox and a ram];
Baal (II) an ox and a ram; [Baal (III) an ox and a ram, Baal (IV) an ox and a ram];
Baal (V) a ox and a ram; Baal (VI) an o[x and a ram; Baal (VII)[3] an ox and] a ram;
1.148 R 5 Earth and Heaven a ram; the Kothar[at] a ram; Yarih [a ram; Athtar a ram];
Saphon a ram; Kothar a ram; Pidray a ram; Mountains and Va[lleys] a ram;
Athirat a ram; Anat a ram; Shapsh a ram; Arsiy a ram; Athtart a ram;
Ishhara a ram; the gods who help Baal[4] <a ram>; Baal a ram; Reshef a ram; Dadmish a ram;

1. Sc. for the gods of Saphon.
2. The amount of space supports Pardee's (1992: 162) reconstruction (twelve signs including word-dividers) rather than *KTU*^{2}'s (nineteen), or Xella's (1981: 91) and del Olmo's (1992a: 89) (twenty-five!). The same argument apples to subsequent lines.
3. Baals numbered as guidance to reader. There are seven Baals, including Baal Saphon, in KTU 1.47 and parallels. See also ll. 11-12.
4. Cf. KTU 1.47.26 and parallels.

the assembly of the gods a ram; Yam a ram; Kinnar[5] a ram; two oxen, two birds, a cow.

1.148 R 10 [II] And as communion-sacrifices: the god of the ancestor a ram; El [a ram]; Dagan [an o]x; Baal[16] of Saphon an ox [and a ram];
Baal (II) the same; Baal (III) the same; Baal (IV) the same; Baal (V) the same; Baal (VI) the same; Baal (VII) the same.

[III] (ll. 13-17 are in Hurrian)[7]

[IV] When Athtart-of-the-Steppe[8] enters the king's palace
1.148 R 20 [ ] two garments of *sk*[9], seven garments of *mšlt*[10], four garments of *ḫpnt*[11] [ ], fifty-three..., three hundred...[ ], a log[12] of perfumed oil, two *šr'*[13], two *ušpġt*,[14] [two] *pl*[*d*], a pot of..., a jar of balsam, a jar of honey[15]...

1.148 V [V] The gods of Hiyyar[16]: the god of the ancestor a ram; Earth and Heaven a ram;

5. Deified lyre.

6. Text *'bl*: read *b'l*.

7. Laroche (1968: 517-18), del Olmo (1992a: 92). A continuous translation is impossible.

8. That is, the cult-image is carried in. Note the hypostasis, and the different one, Athtart-of-the-Window, at KTU 1.43.1.

9. 'Coats of mail': de Moor (1970b: 308).

10. 'Accessory shirts': de Moor (1970b: 308).

11. 'Redingotes': de Moor (1970b: 308). The kinds of material are uncertain. These are ritual garments for clothing the image of the goddess. See de Tarragon (1980: 109).

12. A measure of oil (cf. Heb. *lōg*).

13. 'Laces': de Moor (1970b: 308).

14. Also occurs at KTU 1.43.4. 'Neck pieces of mail': de Moor (1970b: 308).

15. On honey in the cult see n. 15 to KTU 1.ii [21], n. 50 to KTU 1.14 ii 19 and n. 33 to KTU 1.41.21.

16. Sc. (sacrifices for) the gods (of the month) Hiyyar. Each month presumably had its patron-deities.

1.148 V 25 El a ram; the Kotharat a ram;
Dagan a ram; Baal of Aleppo an ox and a ram;
Baal of Saphon an ox and a ram;
Thirathiy[17] an ox and a ram;
Yarih a ram; Saphon a sheep;
1.148 V 30 Kothar a ram; Athtar a ram;
Athirat a ram; *šgr*-and-*ḫtm*[18] a ram;
[ ] a ram; Reshef-Idrap[19] a sheep;
[ ][20] a ram;
[ ] a ram;

(ll. 35-37 missing;
ll. 38-43 yield no clear sense.)[21]

[an o]x and a ram; Baal [ ]
1.148 V 45 ...

17. 'Winey'? Cf. *trṯ*, var. *ṯrṯ*, the god of wine (Heb. *tîrôš*): see Xella (1981: 99) and Healey (1995a: cols. 1642-45).

18. A binomial deity or a pair? On the names cf. de Moor (1969a: 178), Xella (1981: 99): perhaps a herd-deity: 'Progeny-and-cattle-wealth'?

19. Idrap appears as a DN, so appears to be paired here with Reshef. See Xella (1981: 100).

20. Pardee (1992: 157), reads [ ]m*ḏr*; Xella (1981: 92) and Del Olmo (1992: 91) read [*il.t*]'*ḏr*: 'the gods who help <Baal>' (cf. l. 8 above). *KTU*^{2}: [ ]g*šr*.

21. Contrast Xella (1981: 92, 94), del Olmo (1992a: 91) and *KTU*^{2} with Pardee (1992: 157, 159, 169-70).

KTU 1.161: A Royal Funeral Liturgy

(KTU 1.161 = RS 34.126)

Select Bibliography

Caquot 1975; de Moor 1976, 1981–82: 116-17, 1987: 165-68; Pope 1977b: 177-81; Pitard 1978, 1987; L'Heureux 1979: 187-93; Xella 1981: 279-87; Bordreuil and Pardee 1982, 1991; Dietrich and Loretz 1983, 1991b; Levine and de Tarragon 1984, 1997b; Taylor 1985, 1988; Spronk 1986: 189-93; Pitard 1987; Lewis 1989: 5-46; Caquot 1989: 103-10; Tropper 1989: 144-50, 1993a; del Olmo 1992a: 130-34; Pardee 1993b: 208-10, 1996, 1997c: 357-58; Aboud 1994: 157-65; Schmidt 1994: 100-20; Pardee 2000: 816-25, 2001a: 100-105.

This tablet, well-preserved apart from the top right hand corner of the recto, has been characterized as a *kispum*-ritual (de Moor 1976: 333 n. 72; Pope 1977b: 177-82; Pitard 1978: 67), as the order of service for the funeral[1] of King Niqmad (IV?),[2] the penultimate king of Ugarit, father of the Ammurapi of l. 31, and perhaps involving a *kispum*-rite in the invocation of the late king's ancestors,[3] and as a part of a coronation

1. Pardee (1996: 274): the text is 'funerary in nature, rather than mortuary'.

2. His name would have appeared (theoretically, and depending of course on the date of the tablet) in the missing section of KTU 1.113.11-17. Three earlier kings of this name may appear at ll. 20 left ([*nqm*]*d*?—though not in my view: see above, n. 11 *ad loc.*), l. 23 left ([*nq*]*md*) and l. 25 right (*nqmd*). Mention of an earlier three would make him the fourth of the name. Indeed, in view of what I suppose to be an error in Kitchen's computation he would be the fifth, since Kitchen already lists four, but without including the penultimate king in the overall dynasty (the Niqmad of the present text). Healey (1978: 86) identifies him as III, as have subsequent commentators. Cf. discussion by Xella (1981: 285-86) and Levine and de Tarragon (1984: 653), and notes at KTU 1.113 above. Their observation on the omission of Ibiran(u) from the present text points to the canonical nature of king-lists, which edit out those who are subsequently in bad grace. The question of the identity of the king at KTU 1.113.20 remains problematic.

3. One intention of such a composite ritual would probably have been the desire to express solidarity between past and present, and in particular its legitimizing power on behalf of the new king. See discussion on KTU 1.113: a list of ancient kings, presented if only by default as a line of descent, each successor the 'son' of his predecessor, implicitly leads to the expectation that the next generation too is included in the line. Though the list of names may be selective, it is probably to be understood, as suggested by Pitard (1978: 69) to involve the entire dynastic

ritual, with elements of the previous two (Malamat 1989: 100; Levine 1993: 378, 473; Schmidt 1994).[4] The allusion to Ammurapi, last king of the city, dates the text to about the turn of the thirteenth–twelfth century BCE. In spite of uncertainties about the precise construction, it appears to be the text of a liturgy, apart from l. 1 and ll. 27-30. Levine and de Tarragon (1984: 649) state that 'the liturgy was declaimed by a priest who stood before a gathering in the royal palace...' at the accession of Ammurapi (III). They speak further (*loc. cit.*) of 'the royal cult of the dead'. This text, involving the summoning up of *rpum*, corresponding to the biblical *rᵉpā'îm*, provides a remarkable backdrop to Isa. 14.9-21. The whole of the text, apart from the first line which identifies the text, is to be read as the direct speech of one priest,[5] addressed to various deities, kings and other participants in the ritual.

1.161 R 1 Order of service[6] for the sacrifice(s) of the (divine) Winged Disc[7]:

line. Xella (1981: 285) speaks of the 'legendary ancestors', which draws attention to the ideological nature of such lists.

4. Note Schmidt's (1994: 100) question: '*KTU* 1.161: funerary liturgy or coronation liturgy?'. Against the tendency to opt for the former, he urges the case for the latter. But in the interest of political reality perhaps the two may be combined, for the smooth accession of the next king is as vital to the community as the future welfare of the dead king. This in fact is the gist of his subsequent discussion (pp. 104-106). This assessment is rejected by Pardee (1996: 275).

5. Thus Bordreuil and Pardee (1991: 155-56). Contrast the views expressed in next note. They have the priest pronounce words understood to be spoken by Shapsh in ll. 21-22. I have not followed this interpretation.

6. Not a *marziḥu*, as proposed by Margalit (1989: 273) and Dietrich and Loretz (1983: 23), but a funeral, perhaps including a *kispum*-rite. Healey (1978: 85) draws attention to the similar form in Heb.: *zōt tōrat zebaḥ*, Lev. 7.11. It is not intended to be read as a complete order of service, but rather as a set of instructions, with a number of liturgical texts from key points of the ritual. Cf. Pitard's remarks (1978: 66 §2). The first word is *spr*. 'Booklet': Caquot (1975: 427; 1989: 105) and Bordreuil and Pardee (1982: 122; 1991: 154); 'ritual': Healey (1978: 84); 'Book': Pitard (1978: 66); 'liturgy': Xella (1981: 282-83; n. 'libretto'). Xella explains the text as addressed to a group (ll. 2-3, 9-10) and to a single person ('the king?' ll. 4-8, 11-12). Levine and de Tarragon (1984: 649): 'the written record'. Spronk (1986: 189) and de Moor (1987: 166): 'report', which explains their treatment of ll. 2-12 as narrative.

7. Ug. *ẓlm*. See Caquot (1975: 428). The *ẓlm* are generally understood to be 'shades', but whether this is a designation of them as 'ghosts', or refers to their shading, and hence protecting, their descendants and the kingdom, remains uncer

'You are invoked[8], O saviours[9] of the under[world][10],
you are summoned[11], O assembly of Di[dan][12].

tain. 'Funerary' (lit. 'of a shade'): Bordreuil and Pardee (1982: 122; 1991: 154). First read as *qlm*. Taking it thus, de Moor (1976: 341): 'the Swift Ones' (√*qll*, 'be swift'); Pope (1977a: 177-78): 'intonation (sacrifices)' (√*qwl*); Clifford (unpublished work cited by Pitard 1978: 67): 'fallen ones' (√*qll*, 'fall'); Healey (1978: 84-85): 'laments/invocations'. Lipiński (1978: 98) took it to mean '(sacrifice of) a child', interpreting the text as a *molk*-sacrifice. Healey notes *ẓlm*, 'protectors' as a viable alternative. Pitard likes this, but considers it 'highly speculative'. Levine and de Tarragon (1984: 650-52): 'patrons', but endorsing the 'protectors' interpretation, which is in turn criticized by de Moor (1987: 166 n. 1). They cite Isa. 25.4 and Ps. 121.5-6 and a number of other examples of the figure. Pardee (1997c: 357 and n. 2) has now turned to this view. Xella: 'statue(?)' (1981: 282-84). This would also be attractive if pl., as it is for Dietrich and Loretz (1983: 23). See the useful discussion of this option in Schmidt (1994: 110-11). At Alalakh, ^{d}alam = *ṣalmu* 'would refer to the statue of a deceased king to which offerings were made prior to its deposit in the royal grave'. In this case we might envisage images of the late Niqmad or of several dead kings to be present. Lewis (1989: 10-12) makes a good case for understanding *ẓlm* as 'darkness', and cites Heb. *ṣalmût* (*ṣalmāwet*). Note also Ug. *ẓlmt*, appearing in KTU 1.4 ii 55 and 1.8 ii 8. He translates *dbḥ ẓlm* as 'nocturnal sacrifices'. Schmidt (1994: 109-12) himself modifies Xella's position, and understands *ẓlm* to denote Ẓalmu, a form of Shapsh, based on Dalley's (1986: 93, 97-98) recognition of Ṣalmu = Shamash. I am inclined to accept this view. The image of the winged disc connected with Ṣalmu is associated with the king in Ugaritic iconography, as attested on a number of terracotta ritual vessels (e.g. RS 75.247 and RS 78.41 + 81.3659; Yon 1991: 332 fig. 12 d. e) and on the small El stela RS 8.295 (Wyatt 1983b; Yon 1991: 336 fig. 16a). The idea of the winged disc used specifically in the royal cult is in no way surprising, for not only is it a feature of both the Eg. and the Assyrian royal cultus, but is consistent with the WS mythology, in which the royal gods Shahar and Shalem, mythic forms of the king (Wyatt 1996b: 224-29) are the sons of Shapsh (KTU 1.23.54), geminated as Athirat and Rahmay. The term *ẓlm* is cognate with Heb. *ṣelem* (cf. Livingstone 1995: col. 842) which has been generalized into any divine image.

8. Ug. *qritm*. Healey (1978: 85) calls this a 'prescriptive perfect', translating 'You (plural) (will) have invoked'. Del Olmo (1992a: 131) treats it and the following *qbitm* as interrogative: 'have you...?'. It is better explained as a pass., as by R.M. Good (1980: 41), Bordreuil and Pardee (1982: 123; 1991: 154), Taylor (1988: 152, 158 n. 18), Caquot (1989: 106) and Lewis (1989: 7, 12-14). This position is criticized by Levine and de Tarragon (1984: 652: but note Lewis's response [1989: 13], with clarification: 'you are hereby summoned') and by Schmidt (1994: 113, citing Verreet [1983: 234-36; 1984: 324-30] in support). Pardee (1997c: 357-58) has also modified his previous position. Accepting however the view that it is an internal pass., it is worth asking why the pass. mood should be consistently used in

Invoked is[13] Ulkan[14] the saviour;
1.161 R 5 invoked is Taruman the saviour.
invoked is Sidan-and[15]-Radan;

the invocation of the dead? I would explain it on the basis of the inherent danger of dealing with underworld beings. The ethos is established in the new understanding of KTU 1.17 i 27 and parallels proposed by Xella (1982: 194) and Husser (1995: 124). See n. 30 *ad loc.* There the whole point is to keep the souls of the dead below ground. Here it is to summon them up. We detect something of the danger with which such activity is fraught in the story of the 'witch' of Endor (1 Sam. 28). The pass. address is a means of summoning them, while being able to avoid responsibility for so doing. It is almost an impersonal use, in which a third party is held responsible, or even the hint that the dead are summoned by their own inherent nature as intercessors.

9. Lewis (1989: 7, 14): "heroes", which echoes something of the nature of Gk heroes, who are essentially dead figures, now divinized.

10. Ug. *a*[*rṣ*]. On the nuances of the term see KTU 1.1 ii 10, iii [14], and nn. 5, 31 *ad loc.* Not the land of the living, as in L'Heureux's (1979: 201-204, 219-21) understanding of *rpi arṣ* as a military élite.

11. Ug. *qbitm*. Caquot (1975: 428) relates it to Akk. *qabû*. Cf. *qbat* in a fragmentary passage at KTU 1.6 vi 40 (noted by Taylor [1984: 13] and Lewis [1989: 14 and n. 44], who notes that *qabû* can have funerary associations, and can have the sense of 'mourn'). 'I have called...summoned': Pitard (1978: 66, 68), explaining that he has found no examples of 2 pl. vbs in such contexts (p. 73 n. 11 cites KTU 1.40, but here 'probably the entire population of Ugarit' is addressed). Xella (1981: 284) rejects this and translates as 2 pl. 'You have been named': Caquot (1989: 106).

12. Ug. *ddn*, probably a variant on *dtn* of KTU 1.15 iii 4 and KTU 1.124. Kitchen (1977: 141-42) discusses comparative data. He presents a table showing how Ditan can have played a role in the different dynastic lines of the Near East, including Keret of Khabur and early Ugaritic kings. See Lipiński (1978) and Levine and de Tarragon (1984: 655) on the prehistory of Didan, and the latter's hesitation on this aspect of Kitchen's argument. Recent discussion also in Schmidt (1994: 72-82). Didan(u) appears as an ancestor of Hammurabi of Babylon (Finkelstein 1966: 95, 98, 101), and as one of the 'seventeen kings who lived in tents' who head the Assyrian king-list. See now Millard (1997: 463). Lewis (1989: 16) notes that the name may be related to Akk. *ditānu*, 'aurochs' (*CAD*, III [D], 164; *AHw*, I, 173) and in CT 18.7 is equated with *qar-ra*-[*du*], 'warrior'. A heroic and/or theriomorphic reference would do well for an eponymous ancestor. Note also the Heb. PN dātān, and the TN dōtān (Dathan, Dothan). See Annus (1999), Wyatt (1999: 864 n. 30), on possible links between *dtn*/*ddn* and the Greek Titans.

13. Ug. *qra*. 'He has called': Pitard (1978: 66). 'Invoke!': del Olmo (1992a: 131). 'Has been called': Pardee (1993b: 208).

14. This name is read in various manners. Caquot (1975: 427): *b.lkn*. Healey

invoked is the eternal one?[16], Thar[17].
They have been invoked[18], the ancient[19] saviours.

1.161 R 10 You are invoked, O saviours of the underworld,
you are summoned[20], assembly of Didan.[21]

(1978: 83): *b*{.}*lkn*. Pitard (1978: 65): *b'lkn*. Bordreuil and Pardee (1982: 122; 1991: 155), Dietrich and Loretz (1983: 23), Levine and de Tarragon (1984: 650), Pitard (1987: 79) and Caquot (1989: 106), *KTU*^{2}: *ulkn*. See Lewis (1989: 17) on the PN formation.

15. Reading *w*$^!$ for *k*.

16. Ug. *'llmn*. Obscure. Is it a n. formation, with *-n*, on *'lm* (cf. the use of this term at KTU 1.108.1)? Why King Thar ('Bull'?) should merit this epithet remains uncertain. De Moor's (1976: 17) explanation, 'child of whom', meaning 'usurper', is described by Healey (1978: 86 n. 17) as 'an etymology of desperation'. Healey wonders whether it means 'Child of Lim'. Pope (1977b: 178) translates *ṯr 'llmn* as 'the Bull Savant'. Spronk (1986: 190): 'the mighty, the unrelated', but we need a PN. Caquot (1989: 106-107 n. 323) notes the similar form *'llmy* at KTU 1.22 i 10, which I have translated 'eternal'. The present form also appears at KTU 1.1 iv 5.

17. Since they are not explicitly stated to be resident in the underworld, Schmidt (1994: 105) concludes that Sidan-and-Radan and Thar are alive and 'represent assembled warriors, nobles, and/or dignitaries'. But I think this is to draw the wrong conclusion. All the figures of ll. 4-8 are framed within the double reference in ll. 2-3 and 9-10 to *rpi arṣ* || *qbṣ ddn*, and are therefore qualified by it, and furthermore the latter two named *rpum* are qualified both at l. 8 and at l. 24 as *rpim qdmym*, unless this too qualifies all four figures. This precludes their being alive.

18. I have tried to preserve the word order here as far as is practicable. The vb comes conspicuously at the beginning of each statement throughout ll. 2-12. Although they are all to be read as indic., the word order conveys a sense of command. Bordreuil and Pardee (1982: 123; 1991: 155) make this act., which reads oddly after the series of pass. forms. I have interpreted it also as pass. (internal G pass.). It also makes better sense if the whole text is recited: the statement in l. 8 summarizes ll. 4-7 for the worshippers, before the priest resumes his direct address to the *rpum* in l. 9. Caquot (1989: 107), who takes the pass. line, translates *qru* here as act. Del Olmo (1992a: 132) does not distinguish it from the *qra* forms: 'invoke...!'.

19. Ug. *qdmym*. The term evokes primordiality, and thus authority and prestige. Presumably these members of the *rpum* are to be included among the list of legendary royal ancestors of the Ugaritic dynasty, though they were perhaps earlier than the kings whose names appear in KTU 1.113.

20. 'I have called...summoned': Pitard (1978: 66).

21. Levine and de Tarragon (1984: 655-56) are surely right in warning us against a too facile equating of myth and history. The *rpum* down to this point in the liturgy are sharply demarcated by the text itself from the historical kings who follow.

Invoked is Ammithtamru[22] the king[23]
(and) invoked as well[24] is Niqmad the king[25].
O throne[26] of Niqmad[27], may you be mourned!

22. I have generally omitted the *-u* ending of Ug. names. Occasionally I have retained them for ease of pronunciation in English.

23. Del Olmo (1992a: 132 n. 82) notes that the application of the term *mlk* to a dead king has a theological rather than a political significance. (Of course the 'political' term also carries powerful theological and ideological resonances.) He translates as 'king/*Milku* PN', leaving open the question of the identification of the king with a group of dead kings, the *mlkm*, perhaps divine but not yet having achieved the status of the *rpum*. See also del Olmo (1987a: 60-62). The class of gods *mlkm* = ^{d}MA.LIK.MEŠ at KTU 1.47.33 = 118.32 = RS 20.24.32 probably underlies the present usage.

24. Ug. *u*: see Levine and de Tarragon (1984: 652). Spronk (1986: 191) and de Moor (1987: 167): 'woe!'. See also Caquot (1989: 327) and Aboud (1994: 161). See also at l. 26. But in view of the differentiation of two king Niqmad's here (n. 27), the reference both here and at l. 26 is to the ancestor, not to the recently deceased. The cry would thus be inappropriate.

25. 'King...king'. Evidently Niqmad (the earlier) and Ammithtamru are not (yet) classed as *rpum*.

26. Ug. *ksi*, hardly the sg. nom. subj. of the act. vb (as for Healey 1978: 84), Levine and de Tarragon (1984: 649: the throne weeping, along with the footstool and table), Bordreuil and Pardee (1982: 123; sg. or pl. 1991: 154 sg. only). Pitard (1987: 79) draws attention to its difficulty, as does Lewis (1989: 19-20). The solution offered by Taylor (1985) seems the best: he takes it as voc. sg. But he still (1988: 153) has the throne and other furniture weeping. Caquot (1989: 107): 'I weep for the thrones of Niqmad'.

27. Bordreuil and Pardee (1991: 158) seem to have been the first to recognize the likelihood that the kings identified as Niqmad in ll. 12 and 13 are not the same person. The first is invoked with Ammithtamru as a past king attending the *kispum* on behalf of the royal ancestors. He may be tentatively identified with either the Niqmad at KTU 1.113.23 (left), or with the putative Niqmad (otherwise Arḫalbu) to be restored at l. 20 (left). The second, the penultimate king of Ugarit, is the subject of the present funeral rites. In view of a possibly considerable time lapse between the two kings of the present text, they further propose that ll. 1-12 constitute a fixed liturgy, to which further material would have been added *ad sensum* in a given funerary context. Their identification of the recently deceased king as Niqmad III seems to require modification in the light of discussion. If KTU 1.113.20 be read as a *d* instead of a *b*, he becomes IV. See KTU 1.6 vi 57 n. 132 and nn. 9, 11 at KTU 1.113. Bordreuil and Pardee state, perhaps with a ghost of a smile, that 'whatever trouble this repetition may cause us today, it is quite clear that for the officiant at the obsequies of Niqmad (III) there was no possibility of confusion'!

And[28] lamented be his[29] footstool[30].
1.161 R 15 Let the table of the king[31] be mourned in his presence.
But let their tears be swallowed[32],
and their dreadful lamentations[33].

28. Dietrich and Loretz (1983: 24) inset ll. 14-22 (...*'pr*) translating the initial *w* as 'Furthermore...'.

29. I take it that the priest addresses the royal throne directly (at the tomb-side for the occasion, the whole liturgy taking place in the throne room, or just as an apostrophe?), and then includes footstool and table parenthetically, so that they are dealt with in the 3 p. allusions. The throne is by far the most important item of furniture, as possession of it authenticates a king's power. Cf. the symbolism of the throne throughout KTU 1.1–1.6. This is in fact the same throne as the divine one in so far as the king ascends the latter in mystical fashion during the coronation rites (Wyatt 1986a). The footstool however also has a cosmic symbolism, perhaps representing the earth (cf. Isa. 66.1) and the king's enemies (cf. Ps. 110.1), while the table is probably a symbol of royal patronage and commensality (cf. 2 Sam. 9.7-13; 1 Kgs 2.7).

30. Note the chiasmus, marked by its abrupt departure from the previous pattern of word order. The reading *hdm* is in some doubt: see Pitard (cf. 1978: 65, 70; 1987: 78, 81-82), Lewis (1989: 21) and Bordreuil and Pardee (1982: 126; 1991: 153). *KTU*^{2} *hdm p'nh*. This pleonastic form is *hapax*. Elsewhere (KTU 1.4 i 34, iv 29; 1.5 vi 13; 1.6 i 60, iii 15, and 1.17 ii 11—all literary contexts) the simple form *hdm* is used.

31. *KTU*^{2} *m*/*k*. Reading *mla*: 'the table is full': Caquot (1975: 427), Healey (1978: 84) and Pitard (1978: 66).

32. Hardly the tears of the furniture (as for Levine and de Tarragon 1984: 650, and Taylor 1985: 317!). The idea of throne, stool and table swallowing back their own tears is scarcely a serious option. Rather the tears of those who mourn, who are now to take comfort from the potency of the invocatory ritual. If this be pass., the obvious question is the identity of the agent. Perhaps the underworld, which swallows all things? Cf. the earth 'swallowing' Dathan and Abiram and their families at Num. 16.31-32a. Caquot (1989: 108): 'let him (the king) swallow his tears'. This also makes sense. There is no question of a ritual banquet here, but Lewis, who has the furniture as subj. (1989: 8, 21-22 and n. 92) appears to think of a feast of tears, citing KTU 1.6 i 10, Pss. 42.4, 80.6 and *CAD*, III [D], 147b: *dīmtu maštītī...bikītu kurmatī*, and *CAD*, II [B], 224a: *kima akali ātakal maruštu bikītu*, 'for bread I ate bitter tears'. On this approach my translation may stand, but with the 'their' a generalized subj., being the participants in the ritual. It would thus constitute an anti-feast.

33. Ug. *'dmt w 'dmt 'dmt*. Caquot (1978: 427), reading *'dmt w 'dmt ṯdmt*, translates '(his tears) have ceased, disgust (?) has ceased'. Healey (1978: 84) with the same reading: '(his tears) have ceased, and his grief has disappeared'. Pitard (1978: 65-66, last word *ṯ*/*'dmt*): '(his tears) are gone(?) and gone(?) are...' (Ar. *'adima*,

Go down[34], Shapsh,
yea, go down, Great Luminary!
May Shapsh shine[35] upon him[36].

'cease'). These scholars all include *udm't h* of l. 16 in the colon. Cf. de Moor (1987: 167). Bordreuil and Pardee (1982: 123; 1991: 155): 'woe! and thrice woe!'. Cf. Levine and de Tarragon (1984: 650, 652). They describe it as 'a rare triplication for dramatic effect'. The phrase *'dmt 'dmt* is to be construed as superlative, as they imply, as with *kmr mrm* at KTU 1.19 i 8 (n. 188 *ad loc.*). Caquot (1989: 108 n. 331) notes the parallel with 'vanity of vanities' in Qoh. 1.2. Cf. *DLU*, 73: 'desolation of desolations!' (homonymous Ar. *'adima*). I have taken the expression to be a further subject of the double-duty vb *ybl'* in l. 16. Note the alliteration between *udm't*, 'tears' and *'dmt*, 'lamentations'. Following a suggestion of Pope (1977b: 180, Ar. *'aḏama*), but with altered stichometry, Schmidt (1994: 107, 117) translates the first occurrences, *'dmt w 'dmt*, as 'gnashing of teeth and more gnashing of teeth'. The third instance he construes with the sequel: 'with gnashing of teeth I bow down, O Shapash'. This is an attractive solution. Perhaps the expression involves a hendiadic pun, however: 'wailing and gnashing of teeth'!

34. Ug. *išḫn*. The *i* is a prothetic on the N stem (Taylor 1985: 315) rather than a 1 p. indicator. Many interpret as 'be burning' (e.g. Bordreuil and Pardee 1982: 123; 1991: 155) (√*šḫn*, 'grow hot'). Cf. the *i* on *ibky* in l. 13. On this understanding I take it that the goddess is invoked to provide warmth amidst the dankness and gloom of the open tomb. To be preferred is the approach of Lewis (1989: 8, 23), evoking the goddess's chthonian role: 'Go down, O Šapšu! | Go down, O Great Light!' (√*šḫḫ*, 'bow down' or *šw·ḫ*, 'sink down'). It looks as though for Lewis the following instructions in ll. 20-26 are also addressed to Shapsh, who thus acts out her role as psychopomp.

35. Ug. *tṣḥ*. Either 'cry' (√*ṣḥ*) or 'shine' (√*ṣḫḥ*): Caquot (1975: 429). He tentatively accepts the second. So also Healey (1978: 874): 'may you be dazzling...'. Pitard (1978: 66) opts for the first: 'let Šapšu call to us', as do Bordreuil and Pardee (1982: 123; 1991: 155), Dietrich and Loretz (1983: 24), Levine and de Tarragon (1984: 650) and del Olmo (1992a: 132): *'Šapšu* replies'. But the second makes better contextual sense in view of the preceding two cola. Bordreuil and Pardee (1991: 159), accepting the first sense, at the same time suggest that because the word is ambiguous, it may serve deliberately by way of a pun as transition from shining to calling. It may, furthermore, be either 3 f. or 2 f. sg., at least on consonantal structure, which leaves open the possibility that Shapsh is now being addressed in the second person.

36. Ug. *'ln*. Shapsh's involvement in the underworld is clear from the closing hymn of KTU 1.6 vi 54-58. Her presence there appears to raise a hope of some redemptive capacity among the dead ancestors. On the 'cry out' interpretation, is Shapsh supposed to declaim the following lines? For del Olmo (1992a: 132) *'ln* means 'over him', the (dead) king over whom Shapsh shines. The precise nuance may be 'above him'. I have adopted del Olmo's approach, though the sense could

1.161 R 20 After[37] your lords[38], from the throne[39],[40]
After your lords into the underworld go down:[41]

also be 'on us'. The colon would then be taken as free-standing, a kind of blessing uttered on the side at the point where the goddess is bidden to descend into the underworld. The sentiment on this approach is almost 'may Shapsh continue to shine upon us'. Schmidt (1994: 108, 117) treats it as a vb: 'lift me up (O Shapash, please shine!)'. I think the 3 p. approach is preferable, because even when a primary objective of funerary ritual is directed to the fears of the living, it is generally presented in terms of benefits for the dead.

37. Ug. *aṯr*. 'After': Caquot (1975: 427) and Healey (1978: 84). 'To the place of': Pitard (1978: 66).

38. These are the king's predecessors, summoned to attend on him at his descent.

39. Text *ksh*; *KTU*^{2} reads *ks<i >h*. Should we read *ksh*, 'his throne', seeing the same word *ks* as at KTU 1.1 iii 12? Or perhaps just *ksi*? (For Taylor [1988: 153] it is evidently another use of the voc., though he transliterates as *ksh*.) Or even 'his cup' (thus Caquot 1975: 427; Pitard 1978: 66), placed in the royal tomb? This is an attractive approach, notwithstanding Xella's (1981: 287) doubt. Discussion of the options in Lewis (1989: 24-25). While in strictly grammatical terms it would be 'his cup', it remains voc. in force, and so the 'his' is untranslated in English idiom. The *-h* refers back to the antecedent *b'lk* as a grammatical requirement rather than a word to be translated. It is more likely that a royal cup is placed in the tomb than a throne, which would be required for a successor. The tombs at Ugarit are not large enough to have housed the quantities of furniture found, for example, in Tutankhamun's tomb. Taylor (1988: 156-75), arguing that it is precisely the throne which goes down, cites Isa. 14.9 as an example of underworld thrones for the dead. Schmidt (1994: 105) also understands the throne to be lowered. The whole line is taken to mean 'after your lord, from the throne...' by Levine and de Tarragon (1984: 650). This could be construed with ll. 21-22 as staircase parallelism. See also Pardee (1993b: 209), who reads *lksi*, 'from the throne', and apparently has the king addressed (contrast the position cited in next n.). I have accepted this approach. On the shape of the throne, cf. perhaps that of Idrimi of Alalakh discussed by Mayer-Opificius (1983). The king's descent from his throne envisaged here echoes that of El at KTU 1.5 vi 11-14. The god's ritual act in turn is mimetic, echoing that of a dead king.

40. Caquot (1989: 108-109 and nn. 334-35) translates the whole unit 'Following your lord, from your throne...', and wonders whether we have here a ritual allusion to El's descent following Baal's descent into the underworld in KTU 1.5 vi 25 (miscited as 1.6 vi 24). See also the discussion of the problem by Bordreuil and Pardee (1982: 123; 1991: 160), who also make the allusion to El's action. But in the latter discussion, noting the possessive *-k* on *b'lk*, which technically precludes it from being the DN, they wonder instead whether it relates to the *rpum* ('your lords'). My translation relates the suff. rather to the lately deceased king.

into the underworld go down
and fall into the dust,

down to[42] Sidanu-and-Radanu,
down to the eternal one, Thar,
down to the anci<ent> saviours,

1.161 R 25 down to Ammithtamru the king
lower edge and also down to[43] Niqmad[44] the king.'

One[45]—and make an offering,
two—and make an offering,
1.161 V 28 three—and make an offering,
four—and make an offering,

41. These cola are addressed by Shapsh to the newly-deceased Niqmad, according to Pardee's (1993b: 209) translation. I take them to be spoken by the officiating priest.

42. Ug. *ṯḥt*. The prepositional use is at first glance curious and awkward. Healey (1978: 87) suggests that it may mean 'throne', as Ar. *taḥt*. Pitard (1978: 66): 'at the foot of...'. Perhaps it has the sense 'instead of' sometimes found with Heb. *taḥat*. This would make the buried cup (on that interpretation of *l.ksi/h*) a surrogate for the dead kings, who would remain present in the community. Cecchini (1981a) argues for a substantival use of *ṯḥt*, meaning 'subterranean chamber' or 'tomb', which he detects in KAI 2.3, the sarcophagus of Ahiram. Levine and de Tarragon (1984: 650) construe as 'Below is PN...', which is also attractive. Del Olmo (1992a: 133 and n. 88), has 'among', and cites KTU 1.17 v 6-7, where Danel sits *ṯḥt adrm*, which del Olmo translates as 'among the nobles'. Cf. Bordreuil and Pardee (1991: 161) and Aboud (1994: 164). This is however a static sense, and I prefer the sense proposed by Lewis (1989: 9, 25-26), 'down to', with sense of movement. Del Olmo (1983b: 171), followed by Schmidt (1994: 108, 119), took it as 2 sg. of √*nḥt*, 'to descend': 'go down to...', which has the same force as Lewis on a different basis.

43. Text *ṯḥm*. Read *ṯḥt*? Cf. ll. 24-25. Thus Pitard (1978: 72). But note Schmidt's (1994: 108, 119-20) proposal to see a form of √*ḥmm*, 'be warm': 'may you remain warm', expressing the hope that Shapsh will keep the recently deceased Niqmad warm as he goes into the underworld. He however identifies the PN following with this king. If however he is the ancestor (see next note), this proposal is weakened.

44. The ancestral king of l. 12, not the present subject at l. 13.

45. The numbers are cardinals. Pitard (1978: 66) translates as ordinals, continuing 'he has sacrificed'. Bordreuil and Pardee (1982: 123; 1991: 155) have '(times)' in parenthesis. I have excluded the sequence 'one...seven' from the direct speech, since it almost certainly points to a specific sevenfold rite which is placed at this point, and no doubt has its own liturgy. Caquot (1989: 109-10 and n. 337) translates as 'the first (day)...', noting the distinctive use of *'šty*. See also Cecchini (1981b).

five—and make an offering,
six—and make an offering,
1.161 V 30 seven[46]—and make an offering.
You shall present[47] a bird.[48]

'Peace!

Peace on Ammurapi[49],
and peace on his son(s)[50];

peace on his kinsmen[51],

46. Spronk (1986: 193) states that 'the seven sacrifices mentioned in ll. 27-30 coincide with the number of *rpum* called up according to ll. 4-8. But only four are named, on the consensus approach (*ulkn*, *trmn*, *sdn-w-rdn* and *ṯr 'llmn*). But Spronk's suggestion raises the question as to whether we should list them as follows: *ddn*, *ulkn*, *trmn*, *sdn*, *rdn*, *ṯr*, and *'llmn*, who then number seven. But *qbṣ ddn* would appear to be a collective term for the *rpum*, thus excluding *ddn* himself from the seven. He is invoked directly in KTU 1.124, however. If we retain the normal arrangement, four *rpum* are named, and perhaps are summoned up from the four cardinal points? Del Olmo (1992a: 131 n. 78) also appears to envisage seven kings, seven sacrifices and seven blessings. Bordreuil and Pardee (1992: 160), having distinguished the two Niqmad's, list seven as follows: *ddn*, *ulkn*, *trmn*, *sdn-w-rdn*, *ṯr 'llmn*, *'mṯtmr* and *nqmd* (the earlier of the two mentioned). Perhaps seven names were always retained in such liturgies, whatever fluidity might be observed over the actual names used. The absence of the PN Keret is noteworthy. There is nothing to justify the supposition that Keret was himself directly invoked as an Ugaritic royal ancestor, notwithstanding his own link with Ditan (KTU 1.15 iii 15). See n. 156 *ad loc.* and also at n. 17 above.

47. Reading *tqdm* (discussed Pitard 1987: 84-85). *KTU*[1] read tqd*š*(?), 'you shall consecrate'. *KTU*[2] *tqdm*.

48. Schmidt (1994: 108, 120 and n. 367) translates 'the sacred assembly is convened!', and cites Heb. *'āṣar*, 'to retain', *ṣārâ*, 'sacred assembly', EA Akk. *ḫaṣāru*.

49. 'The king is dead! Long live the king!' is the sentiment. Ironically, Ammurapi was the last king of Ugarit. The city was destroyed in the early years of the twelfth century BCE.

50. Read *bn*[!]*h* rather than *bah* of *KTU*[2] (proposed by Dietrich and Loretz 1983: 17). 'Household': Levine and de Tarragon (1984: 651), *bth*.

51. Ug. [*ar*]*y*[*h*], Caquot (1975: 428). *KTU*[1] reads [q]r*yt*[h]: '[his c]ity'; *KTU*[2] reads *ṯryl*, PN Tharielli. This was perhaps Ammurapi's queen. See Cunchillos (1989: 293-95 n. 9, 342 n. 1). She appears in KTU 2.14.8, 12, 17; 2.16.2; 2.34.2. The name also occurs in KTU 6.13.2 (one of the Dagan stelae) and 7.53.4. The syllabic form *Šarelli* appears in a number of Akk. tablets. Discussion in Pitard (1987: 85-86) and Caquot (1989: 110 n. 341, after Nougayrol 1968c: 261 n. 1 and Speiser [note to Nougayrol]) who wonders whether it was not a title, 'the king's sister'. Against this see Singer 1999: 690-91 (§15.6.1.2) with further references.

peace on his house;

peace on Ugarit,
peace[52] on her[53] gate(s)!'

52. Pitard (1978: 72) draws attention to the sevenfold repetition of *šlm*. Perhaps these blessings correspond to the sevenfold sacrifice just performed, and again, perhaps, with one blessing corresponding to each offering. Bordreuil and Pardee (1982: 123; 1991: 155) have the first *šlm* a qualification of l. 30b: 'you will present a bird as a saving sacrifice'. But this misses the point of the group of seven, unless we understand that seven birds are offered in succession. In Heb. the sacrificial sense of *šlm*(*m*) occurs only in the pl. Dietrich and Loretz (1983: 24) treat the initial sequence *šlm šlm* in l. 31 as though superlative (cf. *'dnt 'dnt* above); but the second word would require to be pl.: *šlmm*.

53. Levine and de Tarragon (1984: 651) are right to use the f. possessive. Cities are 'daughters', the daughter-wives of their patron deities (Wyatt 1996b: 266-68 with refs.).

KTU 1.169: An Incantation for the Exorcism of a Possessed Adolescent

(KTU 1.169 = RIH 78.20)

Select Bibliography

Xella 1978b; Caquot 1978–79, 1984, 1989: 53-60; Bordreuil and Caquot 1980: 346-50; Avishur 1981; de Moor 1980b, 1981–82: 114-15, 1986: 257, 1987: 183-86; Loretz and Xella 1981; Saracino 1982, 1984; Fleming 1991, 1997a; del Olmo 1992a: 259-60; Watson 1992c; Pardee 1993b: 211-13, 2000: 875-93, 2001a: 153-55.

The upper portion of a tablet, written only on the recto. The surviving text is in good order. This has not made detailed interpretation much easier, since many lexical items appear here for the first time. It deals with a rite of exorcism. Apart from that, scholars are in disagreement on most matters of interpretation. The following translation is also provisional, and makes no claim to have solved the outstanding issues. Avishur (1981: 16) suggests that ll. 2-7 are addressed to the patient, and from ll. 8 onward to the 'ghost'. In my view, a case can be made for the opposite, that the demon is addressed in ll. 1b-10 (l. 5 an aside to the exorcist's staff), and from *lk* in l. 10 onward the patient, with a resumption of the address to the demon in l. 17. I have placed rubrics at the right hand side of the text to indicate the addressee. Caquot (1984: 164) on the other hand sees the entire text addressed to the demon. It is the difficulty of resolving even so preliminary a matter as this which illustrates most graphically the intractability of the text.

1.169 1 Exorcising[1] the demons[2] of an adolescent[3]. [TITLE]

1. Ug. *ydy*. On √*ydy* (= Heb. *yādâ*), 'drive away' see Tropper and Verreet (1988: 340-43). It occurs in KTU 1.16 iv 18 (originally four times in the passage, || *grš*, with *ydt*, 'remover' in l. 27) and at 1.100.5 and parallels. I have taken it here as n. use of the inf. So also Caquot (1989: 54 and n. 1) who takes *ydy* by itself as the heading of the text, and del Olmo (1992a: 259). Cf. de Moor (1986: 255; 1987: 183) on the first three words as the title. Others take as 3 m. sg. of the G-stem, e.g. Bordreuil and Caquot (1980: 350), perhaps with Horon (cf. l. 9) as subj., Avishur (1981: 15, no identification of subj. offered), Fleming (1991: 142; 1997a: 301), perhaps with Baal (cf. l. 2) as subj.

2. Ug. *dbbm*. Bordreuil and Caquot (1980: 347, 350): 'calumniators...incanta-

May the sp[irit][4] of Baal[5] expel[6] you, [TO THE DEMON]

tors', explaining it by reference to Akk. *dabābum*, 'speak', *dabbibu*, 'calumniator', *bēl dabābi*, 'adversary', also noting Ar. *dabba*, 'crawl'. So also Fleming (1991: 142-44; 1997a: 301): 'accuser'. More neutrally, 'words': Caquot (1989: 54). 'Enemies': Avishur (1981: 17). 'Flying demons': de Moor (1981–82: 114; 1987: 183). At KTU 1.4 i 39 I have translated it as 'monsters', but the term there may denote something different, and may be a different word. 'Flies': Saracino (1982: 339), a suggestion that makes his first line read 'may he drive away the flies of the Hero', perhaps not the happiest translation in view of his understanding of this text (following Bordreuil and Caquot [1980: 348] and Loretz and Xella [1981]) as an incantation against impotence! Fleming (1991: 143-44) cites a number of Mesopotamian examples of witchcraft, drawing attention to the term *bēl dabābi*, 'witch' (sc. one who casts evil spells). 'Tormentors': Pardee (1993b: 211), who also espouses the 'male sexual dysfunction' interpretation, as does Fleming. This is dependent on seeing in *ḥṭ* the same kinds of nuance it carries in KTU 1.23.8-9, 37. See nn. 11, 36-38 *ad loc.* and n. 11 to KTU 1.24.9.

3. Ug. *ǵzr*. This term is usually rendered 'hero' in the poetic texts. Here a more neutral sense is perhaps intended. I have attempted to preserve the age factor. Or: 'young man' (de Moor 1987: 183). Bordreuil and Caquot (1980: 347, 350) wonder whether the 'hero' is an allusion to Mot (cf. KTU 1.4 vii 47 etc.), so that it is his familiars who possess the victim. Similarly Saracino (1982: 339). Caquot (1984: 165; 1989: 54-55 and n. 123) prefers to see 'the Hero' as Baal who is invoked. Del Olmo (1992: 259 and n. 169): 'vigour'.

4. Text *r* [ ]. A number of suggested restorations have been made. Bordreuil and Caquot (1980: 347, 350), de Moor (1986: 255): *r*[*ḥṭ*], 'hand'; (1986: 256; 1987: 183): *r*[*ḥ*], 'brea[th]'. De Moor (1980b: 429; 1981–82: 114): *r*['*y*], 'Sh[epherd]'. On this rendering de Moor reads a chiasmus: *m*ˡ*ḫṭk r*['*y*] parallel *b'l m*ˡ*ḫṭk*: 'He who wakes you up is the Sh[epherd] || Ba'lu is the one who wakes you up!'. This is in accordance with de Moor's understanding of *hdr'y* in KTU 1.108.3 (n. 8 *ad loc.*). Caquot (1989: 55 and n. 125): *r*[*gm*], 'speech'. Fleming (1991: 142; 1997a: 301): *r*[*pu*], 'R[āpi'u(??)]'. If the word is the subj. of the vb *tgḫṭk*, then *rḥ*, as f., is a better candidate than the alternatives. The word *tgḫṭk* is itself very problematic. See n. 6.

5. Cf. del Olmo (1992a: 259 n. 170): 'the great exorcizer'. Perhaps Baal is here 'the lord of demons' (*b'l dbbm*), a plausible antecedent for the biblical Beelzebub. This would make the assumed priority of the form Beelzebul (*b'l zbl*), as suggested by Dietrich and Loretz (1980f) and Herrmann (1995b) unnecessary, since the two could be genuine alternatives, already attested independently at Ugarit. This is not to make Beelzebub into a demon, as *r*[*ḥ*] *b'l* appears to be for Bordreuil and Caquot (1980: 347), but rather a god who is powerful against them. Note the observations of Saracino (1982: 340-41). The distinction between gods and demons in ancient Ugarit is probably much the same as in Israel and Judah: 'gods' (or God) are acceptable objects of worship and form a network of symbolic identities in the cult; 'demons' are the harmful powers your enemies invoke. But gods too can be

may it expel you[7]
so that you come out[8]
at[9] the voice of the exorcist[10],

like smoke through a chimney,
like a snake into a green tree[11],

harmful, as is clearly the case with deities such as Anat (war) and Reshef (plague).

6. Ug. *tgḫṭk*, recurring in l. 2. The √*gḫṭ* is unknown in the Semitic languages, as everyone has pointed out. 'Your torment': Bordreuil and Caquot (1980: 347, 350), taking it as a n. qualification of two classes of evil spirit (*dbbm, r*[*ḥ*] *b'l*). 'The spirit, thy ghost(?)': Avishur (1981: 15, 17), tentatively dividing into two n. forms (*tg* + *ḫṭ* + *k* suff.), *tg* perhaps related to Sum. UDUG, Akk. *utukku*, 'spirit' and *ḫṭ* to Sum. GIDIM, Akk. *eṭemmu*, 'ghost'. Saracino (1982: 339) also takes it as two nn.: 'the suffering of your rod', where *ḫṭ*, 'rod' supposedly means 'penis', as in KTU 1.23.37 etc. Similarly 'the affliction of your staff': Fleming (1991: 142, 144-45; 1997: 301); citing Heb. *tûgâ*, 'trouble, sorrow' to account for the first part, and Pardee (1993b: 211). Reading *m*'*ḫṭk*, 'who wakes you up': de Moor (1980b: 429-30; 1981–82: 114), an explanation criticized by Caquot (1984: 164-65). Caquot himself suggests √*gḫṭ* as a *hapax*, with the contextual sense 'cast out'. 'let it throw you out': de Moor (1986: 255-57; 1987: 183), citing Syr. *g'ṭ* (aphel, 'eject'), Ar. *ǧ'ẓ*, 'remove, chase away', LebAr. *ǧǧṭ*, 'draw away, drag', followed by del Olmo (1992a: 259). In view of the intractability of the problem I find de Moor's (1986) explanation the best of those offered so far. As an alternative suggestion, reading *m*'*ḫṭk* (though it is not the preferred option), perhaps we might see here a D-stem of √**a/yḫṭ* (cf. *aḫd, aḫḏ*), with the sense 'seize'? The element *ḫṭ* is deliberate, anticipating the power of the exorcist's staff ('wand') in l. 5.

7. These two cola are interpreted by Pardee (1993b: 211) as 'the pain of your rod he has banished | the producers of the pain of your rod'.

8. Ug. *tṣu*. Bordreuil and Caquot (1980: 347, 50), Pardee (1993b: 211): 3 pl. Avishur (1981: 15): 3 f. sg. De Moor (1980b: 429), Caquot (1984: 162): 2 f. sg.

9. Ug. *lpn*. On this usage see Caquot (1984: 164).

10. Ug. *ṯ'y*. This seems to be the function of the office in the present context. We have met it as 'sacrificer' in KTU 1.6 vi 57 (see n. 131 *ad loc.*), and I suggested 'votary' for *ṯ'* at KTU 1.14 iv 37 etc. (n. 115 *ad loc.*). See also nn. 11, 17 at KTU 1.119.8, 11. 'Him who is offering': de Moor (1980b: 429). This would be the exorcist.

11. Ug. *'mdm* (the *-m* adv.). Among the various possibilities, I prefer to see this as cognate with Akk. *emdu, endu*, 'evergreen cypress' (*AHw*, 211) (an option suggested by Wilfred Watson). Explained by Bordreuil and Caquot (1980: 347) with ref., to Akk. *imdu*, 'basement'. 'Column': de Moor (1980b: 429) and Saracino (1984: 79). 'Ceiling-beam': Avishur (1981: 15). Cf. Akk. *imdu* (*CAD*, VII [I/J], 109-10, *AHw*, 375), 'approaching person': de Moor (1987: 184 and n. 11). 'Foot of the wall': Caquot (1989: 55 and n. 129) and del Olmo (1992a: 259). Any of these is a possible hiding place for a snake.

like goats to a summit,
like lions to a lair[12].[13]

1.169 5 Wand[14], rouse yourself[15]! [TO THE STAFF]
And draw near, wand!

May you[16] be amiss as to your back, [TO THE DEMON]
and may you be ill[17] with regard to
your face[18]![19]

May you eat the bread of fasting[20];
may you drink mere drops[21] without

12. Ug. *skh* (*-h* directional). Cf. Heb. √*swk*, *śwk* and Jer. 25.38, Ps. 10.9 (noted by Bordreuil and Caquot 1980: 347).

13. The image is of a dispersal in all directions, up, down, up and away. Cf. Saracino (1982: 341).

14. Ug. *ḫṭ*. Fleming (1991: 148-50) discusses the symbolic and ritual use of the staff. Cf. the staffs of Moses and Aaron, Exod. 4.2, 7.10 etc., of the king, Ps. 29, and numerous biblical allusions.

15. Ug. *nqh*. De Moor (1980b: 430) relates to Ar. *naqaha*, 'convalesce', and translates (1980b: 429; 1981–82: 114): 'recover', (1987: 184): 'get better!'. Del Olmo (1992a: 260) with same etymology: 'fast'. Caquot (1984: 167) suggests a cognate of Eth. *naqᵉha*, 'wake up'. Avishur (1981: 15): 'his sacrifice'. Cf. Akk. *naqû*.

16. After the aside to the wand in the bicolon of l. 5, the exorcist resumes his address to the demon. 'May it harm' (3 f. sg.): Fleming (1997a: 301).

17. Ug. *ṯḫṭa...trṣ*. Lit. 'go astray, fall short, sin...commit evil'. The choice of theological and moral words is significant, though see comments in Caquot (1984: 167-68). He notes the subjunctive value of the final *-a* in *ṯḫṭa*. The choice of the first is also determined by the wand, *ḫṭ*. On the other hand, a physical disorder is widely regarded in the ancient world as having a spiritual origin, a way of expressing the notion of psychosomatic disorder. Cf. the presuppositions behind Jn 9.2. Fleming (1997a: 301): 'and harm' (still in 3 f. sg.)

18. Ug. *tmnṯk*. Cf. Heb. *tᵉmûnâ*. De Moor (1980b: 429): 'pelvis'. He translates the bicolon: 'You are sinning against your own back | and are transgressing against your own pelvis'. Pardee (1993b: 212) has: 'Should you sin against your body | Should you commit evil against your bodily form?'.

19. 'back...face'. Something of the temporal nuances of these positions (see Wyatt 1996a) may be present here: the demon will have no future—which lies behind him, and he will have no past—which lies before him: it will be as though he never was. Is this just a verbal curse, or is the wand supposed to beat the possessed person (thus expelling the demon)?

20. Ug. *ṣm*. Cf. Heb. *ṣōm*.

21. Ug. *ḫlṣ*. Cf. Akk. *ḫalāṣu*, 'squeeze out'. 'Juice(?)': Bordreuil and Caquot (1980: 348, 350). Watson (1992c) suggests that as the previous colon refers to no

a cup[22],[23]
in the heights,
in the water-meadows[24],
in darkness,[25]
in the sanctuary.[26]
Thus[27],
O sorcerers[28], O demons,

food, this refers to no drink. I have tried to represent this while acknowledging the implications of *ḫlṣ*.

22. Ug. *ṣml*. See Watson (1992c) for the view that this represents Akk. *samālu*, var. *zamaltu*, 'cup'. On the whole idiom, Fleming's (1997a: 301) 'may you drink without a cup(?), squeezing(?) the waterskin' is elegant.

23. If taken to refer to the patient, this might imply abstinence from food and drink being part of the treatment, rather like a modern medicine-bottle instruction: 'to be taken on an empty stomach'. Ancient medicine is not merely ritualistic mumbo-jumbo, but a pragmatic mixture of ritual (psychological) and material (somatic) measures, and is based on long experience. Modern herbalism perpetuates the latter aspect. Or, as here, it may be taken as addressed to the demon, who then has no hiding place in any of the places mentioned afterwards. Thus Fleming (1997a: 301-302). While I have adopted a specific position here concerning addressees of various portions of the text, certainty is elusive. The reference to 'without a cup' also evokes the imagery of KTU 1.96.5.

24. That is, the lowlands, in contrast to the heights. The images may also implicitly contrast the centre (the cosmic mountain) and the periphery (the edge of the cosmic sea). Cf. the spatial oppositions in ll. 3-4 above. Or is *miyt* here the equivalent of *thm*, the 'abyss'?

25. Ug. *ẓlm*. Cf. Ar. *ẓalima*, 'be dark': (Bordreuil and Caquot 1980: 348). I follow them and de Moor (1980b: 429) who distinguish the darkness and the sanctuary, both qualified by *b*. Rather than 'the darkness of the sanctuary', as for del Olmo (1992a: 260). The point is another pair of oppositions, as in the previous cola. The sanctuary is presumably a place of light (as divine splendour?). Cf. remarks by Caquot (1984: 170). Cf. also next note.

26. Margalit (1989a: 271) translates the four locations here as follows: 'heavens... seas... netherworld... QDŠ'. This would give a nice spatial quaternity, the three extremes contrasting with the sanctuary, symbol of the centre.

27. Ug. *aphm*. I take this to have adv. force (cf. *DLU*, 44). Hardly 'his fury' or 'their fury' (de Moor 1980b: 429; 1987: 184).

28. Ug. *kšpm*. Cf. Akk. *kaššapu*, Heb. *kaššāp*. I take the sorcerers (perhaps 'products of sorcery'?) here to be identical with the demons with whom they are associated. Or perhaps what is being exorcized is both the power of the malevolent sorcerers responsible for this possession and the maleficent spirits they have conjured up. Del Olmo (1992a: 260) appears to regard the sorcerers ('conjurors') and Horon and his companions as identical.

1.169 10 may Horon expel (your) familiars[29],
and the Divine Assistant[30] (your) acquaintances.[31]
Depart[32]! [TO THE PATIENT]
Let no words of scorn[33] bring (you)[34] down;[35]
let not your tongue stammer;[36]

29. Ug. *ḥbrm*. 'Friends': Caquot (1989: 57). Cf. de Moor (1987: 185), though his overall understanding is quite different. 'Binders': Avishur (1981: 16). See also Jeffers (1996: 32-35). Sperling (1993) has drawn attention to *kšp* || *ḥbr* (as here) in Isa. 47.9, 11, and points to its Akk. equivalent *kuššupu*, 'to bewitch, cast an evil spell', used in association with *ubburu*, 'to bind magically'. I have attempted to combine the legitimate claims of both these approaches in 'familiars', which has a rather nice demonic nuance in English, and also adequately anticipates the 'acquaintances' (√*yd'*) following in the next colon.

30. Ug. *ġlm*. See n. 9 to KTU 1.119.7. Is he here paired or identical with Horon? This is the result of the prosodic analysis of Bordreuil and Caquot (1980: 348) with regard to ll. 8b-9: a:b:c::c1:c2. They consider *ġlm* to be an epithet of Horon himself, an indication of his youth, as does de Moor (1980b: 432).

31. The syntax of these lines is very obscure. Cf. the following different analyses: Bordreuil and Caquot (1980: 350): 'even here (*aphm*) the sorcerers perform incantations. Horon will chase off (these) companions, the Youth (will chase off these) associates in your favour'; de Moor (1980b: 429): 'his fury (*aphm*), (his) sorcerers | (his) flying demons may he (Ba'lu) drive away! Horonu be a friend | and Ghalami an intimate'. This latter phrase, as Caquot (1984: 171) notes, is similar to KTU 1.6 vi 48-49.

32. Addressed to the patient? Avishur (1981: 16) still has the demon(s) addressed and in the sequel. Similarly Fleming (1991: 151). Published translations depend on the assumed addressee.

33. Ug. *ẓtm*. De Moor (1980b: 429, 432): 'scoffing words', identified as those of the demon. Rather, let the now healed patient be not depressed by the thoughtless remarks of those around him.

34. From *lk* in l. 10 the patient is addressed, as a rite of healing follows the formal exorcism. The vb is either 3 m. pl. with *ẓtm* as subj. or 2 m. sg. internal pass., with the patient as subj.

35. Ug. *lẓtm al tmr*. Or, with de Moor (1980b: 429; cf. 1987: 185): 'Do not speak scoffing words'. These words are addressed to the patient (sg., from the imper. *lk*). The sick man, not in control of his speech, tongue and lips, will have been ranting, stammering and dribbling. More generally, del Olmo (1992a: 260): 'do not let yourself be brought down by difficulties'.

36. I take the tongue (f.) to be subj. of the vb. Or: 'do not stammer with your tongue' (acc. of instrument). This too is addressed to the patient. Apparently muttering and twittering is the usual sign of the presence of spirits: cf. Isa. 8.19. The restoration of coherent speech will be an indication that the healing is complete.

let no dribbling affect you[37]![38]
May the god[39] clothe you
May the god put a garment on you[40],
(turning) into a man[41] and one who has breath[42] on earth,
1.169 15 the madman[43] into a son of man.[44]

37. Ug. √*apq*. De Moor (1980b: 432) suggests a D-stem vb on *apq*, 'stream-bed': 'let flow freely'. In (1987: 185) he translates 'do not dribble so much'. Less fluent saliva may mean more fluent speech! Del Olmo (1992a: 260): 'do not run off!'.

38. The three instances of *al* are here taken to be negatives. If this be addressed to the demon, they would be asseveratives, as for Caquot (1989: 58).

39. Here and in the following colon, the god (*il*) is hardly El, but likely to be Baal or Horon.

40. Ug. *lbš il...'rm il*. De Moor (1980b: 432) suggests that an image of the deity is brought into contact with the patient at this juncture. On such an interpretation it would be Horon or Baal rather than El, however. The latter term (*'rm*) is widely interpreted as a reference to nakedness. I take it, on this approach, that the fourfold oppositions addressed to the demon above are now echoed in a binary expression of normal human activity, being clothed and naked, perhaps meaning in public and in private. 'In all you do' may be the sense. Saracino (1982: 341) makes a useful reference to the symbolism of (re)clothing, as in Gen. 3.21, but fails to account for the 'naked' element here. He like de Moor connects the investment with El. Another approach is that of Loretz and Xella (1981), followed by del Olmo (1992a: 260) and *DLU*, seeing in *'rm* a reference to a cloak or some garment. Cf. Akk. *ermu*. This makes much better sense if addressed to the patient, and is the position I have taken. As a madman he had presumably run about naked. His healing is accompanied and symbolized by his resumption of normal dress behaviour. Cf. 1 Sam. 19.24!

41. I.e., full humanity is to be restored to the demoniac.

42. Ug. *ḥtm*. De Moor (1980b: 430): 'is awake'. Note the continuing wordplay on *ḥṭ*, 'wand'. The sense, given the structure of the bicolon, may be '*compos mentis*'.

43. Ug. *ẓrm*. De Moor (1987: 185): 'the strange one'. The word could plausibly be explained from either of two Heb. forms: √*ẓwr* I, 'be a stranger'; √*ẓwr* II, 'be loathsome'. 'O flow': Pardee (1993b: 212), interpreted as a penile discharge.

44. Cf. n. 30 to KTU 1.14 i 37. Here the ideological sense is missing. Fleming (1991: 153) translates as follows, on a different syntax:

> O man, the one with the staff(s) is indeed gone to the underworld;
> O human, in weakness he is removed.

This is to understand the staff as belonging to the demon. I prefer to see it as the staff of office of the exorcist.

From delirium restored,[45]
lo, by the breath[46] of Athirat the Great Lady
in the h[eart] may you be moulded[47].
I shall recognize you[48] [ ]

[To the] house (to which) I come, [TO THE DEMON]
you shall not come,
[in the dwelling in which I dwell] you shall not dwell![49]

[ ] do not turn your head[50],
[ ]...
...

45. Ug. *banšt npẓl*. Saracino (1982: 339, 341): 'from the infirmity is peeled', drawing attention to Heb. √*pṣl*, Pi. 'peel', in Gen. 30.37-38. However, it looks as though *bn adm* is parallel to the preceding *adm*, and the expression following must be construed with it, and take account of the *l*. Saracino translates *adm banšt npẓl* in isolation, and thus fails to take the context into account. Surveying various options, Caquot (1989: 59 n. 154) explains *npẓl* by ref. to Ar. *faṣala*, 'separate'.

46. Cf. Gen. 2.7. The *npš* is not strictly the breath, but it is, by metonymy, what the breath represents. Just as in Heb. thought there is divine breath in Adam, constituting his 'soul', so here Athirat's breath becomes the restored soul of the patient.

47. Ug. *ltm*. De Moor (1980b: 432) √*lṯm*, 'mould'. This is apparently an allusion to the widespread motif (El [KTU 1.16 v 28-30], Khnum, Yahweh, Aruru etc.) of the deity making a figure out of clay.

48. Ug. *itbnnk*. Following Pardee (1993b: 212). Caquot (1984: 175): 'I discern you'. De Moor (1987: 185): 'let me observe you intently'.

49. Taking this to be addressed to the demon, Avishur (1981: 25) has:

> To the house to (which) I go, thou shalt not go
> [and in the place I dwell] thou shalt not dwell.

He cites KAI 27.5-8 as a parallel:

> To a house I come to—thou shalt not come
> and (to) a yard I walk in—thou shalt not walk in.

and the following Akk. example:

> In a place I stand, thou shalt not stand;
> In a place I sit, thou shalt not sit;
> To a place I go, thou shalt not go;
> To a place I come thou shalt not come.

These examples provide a convincing background for understanding the present as a formula addressed to the demon.

50. Also addressed to the demon, which is commanded to depart without looking back (to avoid eye contact?). Fear of the evil eye is evident from KTU 1.96.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aartun, K.

1984 'Neue Beiträge zum ugaritischen Lexikon i', *UF* 16: 1-52.

1985 'Neue Beiträge zum ugaritischen Lexikon ii', *UF* 17: 1-47.

Aboud, J.

1994 *Die Rolle des Königs und seiner Familie nach den Texten von Ugarit* (FARG, 27, Münster: Ugarit-Verlag).

1998 'Abschnitte vom Aqhat-Epos neu übersetzt und analysiert', in Dietrich and Kottsieper 1998: 1-13.

Aggoula, B.

1990 'Divinités phéniciennes dans un passage du Fihrist d'Ibn al-Naḏ', *JA* 278: 1-12.

Aistleitner, J.

1939 'Die Nikkal-Hymne aus Ras-Schamra', *ZDMG* 93: 52-59.

1954 'Ein Opfertext aus Ugarit (1929 No. 2)', *AcOr* (*Hung.*) 4: 259-69.

1955 'Ein Opfertext aus Ugarit (No. 53) mit Exkurs über kosmologische Beziehungen der ugaritischen Mythologie', *AcOr* (*Hung.*) 5: 1-23.

1964 *Die mythologischen und kultischen Texte aus Ras Schamra* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 2nd edn).

Aitken, K.T.

1990 *The Aqhat Narrative: A Study in the Narrative Structure and Composition of an Ugaritic Tale* (JSSM, 13; Manchester: University of Manchester).

Albright, W.F.

1933 'More Light on the Canaanite Epic of Aleyân Baal and Môt', *BASOR* 50: 13-20.

1936 'New Canaanite Historical and Mythological Data', *BASOR* 63: 23-32.

1938 'Recent Progress in North-Canaanite Research', *BASOR* 70: 18-20.

1941 'Are the Ark and the Ephod Mentioned in Ugaritic Literature?', *BASOR* 83: 39-42.

1943a 'Hebrew *bêth-ḥeber* in Proverbs and Canaanite *bêtu ḫuburi*, "Granary"', *JBL* 62: vi.

1943b 'The Gezer Calendar', *BASOR* 92: 16-26.

1944 'The "Natural Force" of Moses in the Light of Ugaritic', *BASOR* 94: 32-35.

1945 'A New Hebrew Word for "Glaze" in Proverbs 26:13', *BASOR* 98: 24-25.

1953 'The Traditional Home of the Syrian Daniel', *BASOR* 130: 26-27.

1968 *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan: A Historical Analysis of Two Contrasting Faiths* (London: Athlone Press).

1969 *Archeology and the Religion of Israel* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 5th edn).

Albright, W.F., and G.E. Mendenhall

1942 'The Creation of the Composite Bow in Canaanite Mythology', *JNES* 1: 227-29.

Allan, R.

1999 'Now that Summer's Gone; Understanding *qẓ* in KTU 1.24', *SEL* 16: 19-25.

Anati, E.

1963 *Palestine before the Hebrews* (London: Jonathan Cape).

Annus, A.

1999 'Are there Greek Rephaim? On the Etymology of Greek Meropes and Titanes', *UF* 31: 13-30.

Arnaud, D.

1986 *Emar.* VI, 3. *Textes sumériens et acccadiens* (Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations).

1991 'Contribution de l'onomastique du Moyen-Euphrate à la connaissance de l'Emariote', *SEL* 8: 23-46.

Astour, M.C.

1963 'Un texte d'Ugarit récemment découvert et ses rapports avec l'origine des cultes bacchiques grecs', *RHR* 144: 1-15.

1966 'Some New Divine Names from Ugarit', *JAOS* 86: 277-78.

1967 *Hellenosemitica* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2nd edn).

1968 'Two Ugaritic Serpent Charms', *JNES* 27: 13-36.

1969 'La triade de deésses de fertilité à Ugarit et en Grèce', *Ugaritica* 6: 9-23.

1973 'A North Mesopotamian Locale of the Keret Epic?', *UF* 5: 29-39.

1975 'Place Names', *RSP* II: 249–369.

1988 'Remarks on *KTU* 1.96', *SEL* 5: 13-24.

1998 '*RDMN*/RHADAMANTHYS and the Motif of Selective Immortality', in Dietrich and Kottsieper 1998: 55-89.

Avishur, Y.

1972 'Addenda to the Expanded Colon in Ugaritic and Biblical Verse', *UF* 4: 1-10.

1980 'Expressions of the Type *byn ydym* in the Bible and Semitic Languages', *UF* 12: 125-33.

1981 'The Ghost-Expelling Incantation from Ugarit', *UF* 13: 13-25.

1994 *Studies in Hebrew and Ugaritic Psalms* (Publications of the Perry Foundation for Biblical Research; Jerusalem: Magnes Press).

Badre, L., *et al.*

1976 'Notes ougaritiques. I. Keret', *Syria* 53: 95-125.

Baigent, M.

1994 *From the Omens of Babylon: Astrology and Ancient Mesopotamia* (Harmondsworth: Penguin).

Barr, J.

1973 'Ugaritic and Biblical "*šbm*"?', *JSS* 18: 17-39.

Barré, M.L.

1978 '^{d} LAMMA and Rešep at Ugarit: The Hittite Connection', *JAOS* 98: 465-67.

Barton, T.
1994 *Ancient Astrology* (London: Routledge).
Batto, B.F.
1995 'Behemoth', in *DDD*: cols. 315-22.
Bauer, H.
1933 'Die Gottheiten von Ras Schamra', *ZAW* 51: 81-101.
Becking, B.
1995 'Raven', in *DDD*: cols. 1300-301.
1995b 'Thillakhuha', in *DDD*: cols. 1617-18.
1995c 'Ishḫara', in *DDD*: cols. 844-45.
1995d 'Day', in *DDD*: cols. 418-21.
Belmonte, J.A.
1993 'Los productos vegetales de KTU 1.100:64-67', *AuOr* 11: 114-15.
Bernhardt, K.-H.
1955–56 'Anmerkungen zur Interpretation des KRT-Textes von Ras Schamra-Ugarit', *WZG* 5: 102-21
Binger, T.
1997 *Asherah: Goddesses in Ugarit, Israel and the Old Testament* (JSOTSup, 232; CIS, 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
Boda, M.J.
1993 'Ideal Sonship at Ugarit', *UF* 25: 9-24.
Bonanno, A. (ed.)
1986 *Archaeology and Fertility Cult in the Ancient Mediterranean: Papers Presented at the First International Conference on Archaeology of the Ancient Mediterranean, the University of Malta 2-5 September 1985* (Amsterdam: Grüner).
Bordreuil, P.
1983 '"Venin de printemps, venin foudroyant", à propos de RS 24.244 I.5', *UF* 15: 299-300.
1989 'La citadelle sainte du Mont Nanu', *Syria* 66: 275-79.
1995 'Les tablettes alphabétiques de Ras Shamra et de Ras Ibn Hani', in Dietrich and Loretz 1995: 1-5.
Bordreuil P., and A. Caquot
1980 'Les textes en cunéiformes alphabétiques découverts en 1978 à Ibn Hani', *Syria* 57: 343-73.
Bordreuil, P., and F. Malbran-Labat
1995 'Les archives de la maison d'Ourtenou', *CRAIBL*: 443-49.
Bordreuil, P., and D. Pardee
1989 *La Trouvaille Epigraphique de l'Ougarit. 1 Concordance* (RSO 5/1; Paris: ERC).
1982 'Le rituel funéraire ougaritique RS 34.126', *Syria* 59: 121-28.
1991 'RS 34.126', in P. Bordreuil *et al.* (eds.), *Une bibliothèque au sud de la ville. Les textes de la 34e campagne (1973)* (RSO, 7 Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations): 151-63.
1993 'Le combat de Ba'lu avec Yammu d'après les textes ougaritiques', *MARI* 7: 63-70.

Boreux, C.
1939–40 'La stèle C. 86 du Musée du Louvre et les stèles similaires', in *Mélanges syriens offerts à M. René Dussaud* (BAH, 30; Paris: Geuthner), II: 673-87.
Borger, R.
1969 'Weitere ugaritologische Kleinigkeiten', *UF* 1: 1-4.
Bowman, C.H., and R.B. Coote
1980 'A Narrative Incantation for Snake-Bite', *UF* 12: 135-39.
Boyd, J.L., III
1985 'The Etymological Relationship between *NDR* and *NZR* Reconsidered', *UF* 17: 61-75.
Breasted, J.H.
1906 *Ancient Records of Egypt* (Chicago: Chicago University Press; repr., London: Histories and Mysteries of Man [1988]).
Brueggemann, W.
1972 'From Dust to Kingship', *ZAW* 84: 1-18.
Caquot, A.
1962 'Un sacrifice expiatoire à Ras Shamra', *RHPR* 42: 201-11.
1969 'Nouveaux documents ougaritiens', *Syria* 46: 241-65.
1975 'RS 34.126', *ACF* 75: 427-29.
1976 'La tablette RS 24.252 et la question des Rephaïm ougaritiques', *Syria* 53: 295-304.
1978–79 'Ras Ibn Hani 78/20', *ACF* 79: 188-90.
1979 'Un épisode peu connu du mythe de Baal et de la génisse', *UF* 11: 101-104.
1979–80 'Horon: revue critique et données nouvelles', *AAAS* 29–30: 173-80.
1982 'Le dieu Horon: bilan critique et données nouvelles', *RHR* 199: 243-44.
1984 'Une nouvelle interprétation de la tablette ougaritique de Ras Ibn Hani 78/20', *Or* 53: 163-76.
1985 'Une nouvelle interprétation de KTU 1.19 I 1-19', *SEL* 2: 93-114.
1987 'Notes philologiques sur la légende ougaritique de Danel et d'Aqhat. I', *Semitica* 37: 6-16.
1989 'Textes religieux', in Caquot, de Tarragon and Cunchillos 1989: 7-123.
1990 'Notes philologiques sur la légende ougaritique de Danel et d'Aqhat. II (sur KTU 1 18 IV 9-11)', *Semitica* 38: 73-80.
1995 'Une contribution ougaritique à la préhistoire du titre divin Shadday', in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume Paris 1992* (VTsup 61, Leiden: E.J. Brill): 1-12.
Caquot, A., M. Sznycer and A. Herdner
1974 *Textes Ougaritiques*. I. *Mythes et légendes* (Paris: Cerf.)
Caquot A., J.-M. de Tarragon and J.-L. Cunchillos
1989 *Textes Ougaritiques*. II. *Textes religieux et rituels; Correspondance* (Paris: Cerf).
Cartledge, T.W.
1992 *Vows in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* (JSOTSup, 147; Sheffield: JSOT Press).
Cassuto, U.
1936 'The Gezer Calendar and its Historical-Religious Value, *SMSR* 12: 107-

25. Reprinted in *Biblical and Oriental Studies* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1975), II: 211-28.

1938 'Daniel e la pioggia fecondatrice', *Estratto preventivo della RSO*: 4.

1949 '*Zeus Demarous* in the Ugaritic Texts' (Heb.) in *Sepher Dinaburg* (Jerusalem): 65-67. Reprinted in *Biblical and Oriental Studies* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1975), II: 188-92.

1950 'The Seven Wives of King Keret', *BASOR* 119: 18-21. Reprinted in *Biblical and Oriental Studies* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1975), II: 206-208.

1971 *The Goddess Anat* (ET of האלה ענת; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1951; Jerusalem: Magnes Press).

1975 'Il palazzo di Ba'al nella tavola II di Ras Shamra', *Or* 7 (1938): 265-90. Reprinted in *Biblical and Oriental Studies* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1975), II: 113-39.

Cathcart, K.

1987 'Ugaritic *NŠB* and Punic *ŠLB*', *AuOr* 5: 11-15.

1996 'Ilu, Yariḫu and the One with Two Horns and a Tail', in Wyatt, Watson and Lloyd 1996: 1-7.

Cathcart, K., and W.G.E. Watson

1980 'Weathering a Wake: A Cure for a Carousal. A Revised Translation of Ugaritica V Text 1', *PIBA* 4: 35-58.

Caubet, A.

1996 'La musique à Ougarit: nouveaux témoignages matériels', in Wyatt, Watson and Lloyd 1996: 9-31.

Cazelles, H.

1956 'L'hymne ugaritique à Anat', *Syria* 33: 49-57.

1979–80 'Quelle vie la déesse Anat proposait-elle au jeune chasseur Aqhat?', *AAAS* 29–30: 181-83.

Cecchini, S.M.

1981a '*ṯḥr* in KAI 2, 3 e in KTU 1.161', *UF* 13: 27-31.

1981b ''*šty* in ugaritico', *Or* 50: 106-109.

Charlesworth, J.H. (ed.)

1985 *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. II. *Expansions of the 'Old Testament' and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd).

Chenet, G.

1939–40 '*Ḥrb* de Ras Shamra-Ugarit', in *Mélanges syriens offerts à M. René Dussau: Par ses amis et élèves* (BAH, 30; Paris: Geuthner), I: 49-54.

Clear, J.

1976 *Ugaritic Texts in Translation* (Seattle, 2nd edn).

Clemens, D.M.

1993 'KTU 1.108.3-5 (RS 24.252): *dyšr.wyḏmr...*', *UF* 25: 63-74.

Clifford, R.J.

1972 *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Cohen, M.E.

1993 *The Cultic Calendars of the Ancient Near East* (Bethesda, MD: CDL Press).

Coogan, M.D.
1978 *Stories from Ancient Canaan* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press).
Cooper, A.
1987 'MLK 'LM: "Eternal King" or "King of Eternity"?' in Marks and Good 1987: 1-7.
1988 'Two Exegetical Notes on *Aqht*', *UF* 20: 19-26.
Craigie, P.C.
1973 'Helel, Athtar and Phaethon (Jes 14.12-15)', *ZAW* 85: 223-25.
Cunchillos, J.-L.
1989 'Correspondance', in Caquot, de Tarragon and Cunchillos 1989: 239-421.
Cutler, J., and J. Macdonald
1982 'On the Origin of the Ugaritic Text KTU 1.23', *UF* 14: 33-50.
Dahood, M.J.
1964 'Hebrew–Ugaritic Lexicography II', *Biblica* 45: 393-412.
1965 *Psalms I* (AB, 16; New York: Doubleday).
1972 'Ugaritic–Hebrew Parallel Pairs', in *RSP*, I: 71-382
1973 'A Note on *ṭôb* "Rain" ', *Biblica* 54: 404.
Dalley, S.
1986 'The God Ṣalmu and the Winged Disk', *Iraq* 48: 85-101.
Davies, P.R.
1995 Review of *Der Himmel im Alten Testament* by C. Houtman, *JSOT* 67: 123.
Day, J.
1979 'New Light on the Mythological Background of the Allusion to Resheph in Habakkuk iii 5', *VT* 29: 353-55.
1985 *God's Battle with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament* (UCOP, 35; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
1992a 'Ashtaroth', in *ABD*, I: 491
1992b 'Ashtoreth', in *ABD*, I: 491-94.
Day, J. (ed.)
1998 *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (JSOTSup, 270; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
Day, P.L.
1991 'Why is Anat a Warrior and Hunter?' in W. Jobling *et al.* (eds.), *The Bible and the Politics of Exegesis* (Festschrift N.K. Gottwald; Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press): 141-56.
1992 'Anat: Ugarit's "Mistress of Animals" ', *JNES* 51: 181-90.
1995 'Anat', in *DDD*: cols. 62-77.
Deimel, A.
1914 *Pantheon Babylonicum* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute).
Delcor, M.
1967 'Two Special Meanings of the Word *yād* in Biblical Hebrew', *JSS* 12: 230-40.
Dhorme, E.
1933 'Deux tablettes de Ras Shamra de la campagne de 1932', *Syria* 14: 229-37.

Dietrich, M.
1996 'Aspects of the Babylonian Impact on Ugaritic Literature and Religion', in Wyatt, Watson and Lloyd, 1996: 33-47.
Dietrich, M., and I. Kottsieper (eds.)
1998 *'Und Mose schrieb dieses Lied auf...'. Festschrift O. Loretz* (AOAT 250; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag).
Dietrich, M., and O. Loretz
1967 'Zur ugaritischen Lexikographie (II)', *OLZ* 62: cols. 533-52.
1968 'Untersuchungen zur Schrift-und Lautlehre des ugaritischen (I). Der ugaritische Konsonant *ǵ*', *WO* 4: 300-15.
1972 'Zur ugaritischen Lexikon (V)', *UF* 4: 27-35.
1978a 'Ug. **bš*, *tbš*, Hebr. **šbš* (Am 5, 11) sowie Ug. *tšy* und *šbš*', *UF* 10: 434-35.
1978b 'Bemerkungen zum *Aqht*-Text', *UF* 10: 65-71.
1979 'Einzelfragen zu Wörten aus den ugaritischen Mythen und wirtschaftstexten', *UF* 11: 189-98.
1980a 'Die Bannung von Schlangengift (KTU 1.100 und KTU 1.107: 7b-13a.19b-20)', *UF* 12: 153-70.
1980b 'Baal *Rpu* in KTU 1.108; 1.113 und nach 1.17 VI 25-33', *UF* 12: 171-82.
1980c 'Das Porträt einer Königin in KTU 1.14 I 12-15. Zur ugaritischen Lexikographie (XVIII)', *UF* 12: 199-204.
1980d 'Der Ausmarsch des Heeres im Keret-Epos (KTU 1.14 II 27b-III 1 || IV 9b-31)', *UF* 12: 193-97.
1980e 'Die Wehklage über Keret in KTU 1.16 I 2-23 (|| II 35-50)', *UF* 12: 189-92.
1980f 'Die Ba'al-Titel *b'l arṣ* und *aliy qrdm*', *UF* 12: 391-93.
1981 'Neue Studien zu den Ritualtexten aus Ugarit (I)', *UF* 13: 63-100.
1982 'Der Vertrag eines *Mrzḥ*-Klubs in Ugarit. Zum Verständnis von KTU 3.9', *UF* 14: 71-76.
1983 'Neue Studien zu den Ritualtexten aus Ugarit (II)—Nr. 6—Epigraphische und inhaltliche Probleme in KTU 1.161', *UF* 15: 17-24.
1984 'Ugaritisch *'ṯr*, *aṯr*, *aṯry* und *aṯrt*', *UF* 16: 57-62.
1985 'Die "Hörner" der Neumondsichel—Eine Keilschriftsparallele (Ee v 13-18) zu KTU 1.18 IV 9-11', in A. Caquot *et al.*, *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de Mathias Delcor* (AOAT, 215; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker): 113-16.
1987a 'Ringen und laufen als Sport in Ugarit', *UF* 19: 19-21.
1987b 'Die ugaritischen Gefässbezeichnungen *ridn* und *kw*', *UF* 19: 27-32.
1987c 'Ugaritisch *ṯ/ṯy* und Hebräisch *šw'*', *UF* 19: 33-6.
1988 'Ugaritische Rituale und Beschwörungen', in W. Farber *et al.* (eds.), *Texte aus der Umwelt des Altes Testaments* vol. 2/3 *Rituale und Beschwörungen* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus): II, 329-33.
1990 *Mantik in Ugarit? Keilalphabetische Texte der Opferschau—Omensammlungen—Nekromantie* (ALASP, 3; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag).
1991a 'Mythen als Schultexte', *UF* 23: 91-102.
1991b 'Grabbeigaben für den verstorbenen König. Bermerkungen zur Neuausgabe von RS 34.126 = KTU 1.161', *UF* 23: 103-106.

1992 'Die Weisheit des ugaritischen Gottes El im Kontext der altorientalischen Weisheit', *UF* 24: 31-38.
1993 'KTU 1.114, ein "Palimpsest"', *UF* 25: 133-36.

Dietrich, M., and O. Loretz (eds.)
1995 *Ugarit: ein ostmediterranes Kulturzentrum* (ALASP, 7 I; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag).

Dietrich, M., O. Loretz and J. Sanmartín
1974 'Sonnenfinsternis in Ugarit: *PRU* 2,162 (= RS 12.61). Das älteste Dokument über eine Totaleklipse', *UF* 6: 464-65.
1975a 'Der "Neujahrpsalm" RS 24.252 (= Ug. 5, S. 551-557 Nr. 2)', *UF* 7: 115-19.
1975b 'Bemerkungen zur Schlangenbeschwörung RS 24.244', *UF* 7: 121-25.
1975c 'Einzelbemerkungen zu RS 24.251', *UF* 7: 127-31.
1975d 'Lexicalische und literarischeProbleme in RS 1.2 = *CTA* 32 und RS 17.100 = *CTA* Appendice 1', *UF* 7: 147-55.
1975e 'RS 4.474 = CTA 30—Schreibübung oder Religiöser Text?', *UF* 7: 523-24.
1975f 'Das Ritual RS 1.5 = CTA 33', *UF* 7: 525-28.
1975g 'Beiträge zur ugaritischen Textgeschichte (ii)', *UF* 7: 536-39.
1975h 'Der stichometrische Aufbau von RS 24.258 = Ug. 5, S. 545-51 Nr. 1', *UF* 7: 109-14.
1976 'Die angebliche Ug.-He. Parallele *spsg* || *sps(j)g(jm)*', *UF* 8: 37-40.

Dijkstra, M.
1974 'Ba'lu and his Antagonists: Some Remarks on CTA 6 v 1-6', *JANES* 6: 59-68.
1979 'Some Reflections on the Legend of Aqhat', *UF* 11: 199-210.
1986 'An Ugaritic Fable (KTU 1.93)', *UF* 18: 125-28.
1988 'The Legend of Danel and the Rephaim', *UF* 20: 35-52.
1991 'The Weather-God on Two Mountains', *UF* 23: 127-40.
1994 'The Myth of Astarte, the Huntress (KTU 1. 92): New Fragments', *UF* 26: 113-26.
1998 'Astral Myth and the Birth of Shahar and Shalim (KTU 1.23)', in Dietrich and Kottsieper 1998: 265-87.

Dijkstra, M., and J.C. de Moor
1975 'Problematic Passages in the Legend of Aqhatu', *UF* 7: 171-215.

Douglas, M.
1966 *Purity and Danger* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul).

Dressler, H.H.P.
1975 'Is the Bow of Aqhat a Symbol of Virility?', *UF* 7: 217-20.
1979 'The Metamorphosis of a Lacuna: Is *at.ah.wan*...a Proposal of Marriage?', *UF* 11: 211-17.
1983 'Problems with the Collation of the Aqht-Text, Column One', *UF* 15: 43-46.

Driver, G.R.
1956 *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Old Testament Studies, 3; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark).
1965 'Ugaritic Problems', in S. Segert (ed.), *Studia Semitica Ioanni Bakoš dicata* (Bratislava: Vydavatesltvo Slovenskaj Akademie Vied): 95-110.

Dupont-Sommer, A.
1972 (Observations on paper by Herdner [1972]), *CRAIBL* 1972: 699-703.
Durand, J.-M.
1984 'A propos du nom de la hache à Mari', *MARI* 3: 279.
1993 'Le mythologème du combat entre le dieu de l'orage et la mer en Mésopotamie', *MARI* 7: 41-61.
Dussaud, R.
1934 'Compte Rendu de H. Bauer, *Das Alphabet von Ras Schamra*', *Syria* 15: 203-204.
1935 'Le mythe de Ba'al et d'Aleyan d'après des documents nouveaux', *RHR* 111: 5-65.
1936 'Le vrai nom de Baal', *RHR* 113: 5-20.
Edwards, I.E.S., C.J. Gadd and N.G.L. Hammond (eds.)
1970 *The Cambridge Ancient History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3rd edn), I.1.
Eissfeldt, O.
1940 'Zum geographischen Horizont der Ras-Schamra-Texte', *ZDMG* 94: 59-85.
1966 'Sohnespflichten im Alten Orient', *Syria* 43: 39-47.
Ellis, R.S.
1995 'The Trouble with Hairies', *Iraq* 57: 159-65.
Emerton, J.A.
1965 'Ugaritic Notes', *JTS* 16: 438-43.
1969 'The Meaning of the Root "*mzl*" in Ugaritic', *JSS* 14: 22-33.
1972 'A Difficult Part of Mot's Message to Baal in the Ugaritic Texts (CTA 5. i. 4-6)', *AJBA* 2: 50-71.
1978 'Further Notes on CTA 5 I 4-6', *UF* 10: 73-77.
1982 'Leviathan and *ltn*: The Vocalization of the Ugaritic Word for the Dragon', *VT* 32: 327-31.
Engnell, I.
1943 *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells).
1944 'The Text II K from Ras Shamra', in *Mélanges d'histoire des religions et de recherches bibliques offerts à Johannes Pedersen, professeur à la faculté des lettres de Copenhagne, à l'occasion de son soixantième anniversaire 9 décembre 1943* (Horae Soederblomianae, 1; Uppsala: Societas Soederblomiana Upsaliensis).
Epzstein, L.
1986 *Social Justice in the Ancient Near East and the People of the Bible* (ET; Paris: Cerf; London: SCM Press).
Eslinger, L., and G. Taylor (eds)
1988 *Ascribe to the Lord: Biblical and Other Studies in Memory of Peter C. Craigie* (JSOTSup, 67; Sheffield: JSOT Press).
Fales, F.M.
1984 'La radice **mzl* nei testi di Ebla', *SEL* 1: 23-26.
Faulkner, R.O.
1972 *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 2nd edn).

Fensham, F.C.
1971a 'Some Remarks on the First Three Mythological Texts of *Ugaritica* V', *UF* 3: 21-24.
1971b 'Remarks on Certain Difficult Passages in Keret', *JNSL* 1: 11-22.
1972 'The First Ugaritic Texts in *Ugaritica* V and the Old Testament', *VT* 22: 296-303.
1981 'Notes on Keret, CTA 14.103b-114a', *JNSL* 9: 53-66.
1983 'Remarks on Keret 114b-136a (CTA 14: 114b-136a)', *JNSL* 11: 69-78.
Fenton, T.L.
1977 'The Claremont "*mrzḥ*" Tablet, its Text and Meaning', *UF* 9: 71-75.
Finkel, J.
1954 'The Expedition of the Ugaritan King Keret in the Light of Jewish and Kindred Traditions', *PAAJR* 23: 1-28.
1955 'A Mathematical Conundrum in the Ugaritic Keret Poem', *HUCA* 26: 109-49.
Finkelstein, J.J.
1966 'The Genealogy of the Hammurabi Dynasty', *JCS* 20: 95-118.
Fisher, L.R., and F.B. Knutson
1969 'An Enthronement Ritual at Ugarit', *JNES* 28: 157-67.
Fleming, D.E.
1991 'The Voice of the Incantation Priest (RIH 78/20)', *UF* 23: 141-54.
1992 *The Installation of Baal's High-Priestess at Emar* (HSS, 42; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
1997a 'Ugaritic Incantation against Sorcery', in Hallo 1997: 301-302.
1997b 'The *zukru* Festival', in Hallo 1997: 431-36.
Foley, C.M.
1987 'Are the "Gracious Gods" *bn šrm*?' *UF* 19: 61-74.
Fontenrose, J.A.
1959 *Python: A Study of Delphic Myth and its Origins* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
Ford, J.N.
1998 '"Ninety-Nine by the Evil Eye and One from Natural Causes." KTU^2 1.96 in its Near Eastern Context', *UF* 30: 201-78.
2000 'Additions and Corrections to "Ninety-Nine..." ', *UF* 32: 711-15.
Forsyth, N.
1987 *The Old Enemy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
Frankfort, H.
1948 *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature* (Chicago: Chicago University press).
Freilich, D.
1992 'Ili-Malku the *ṯ'y*', *SEL* 9: 21-26.
Friedman, R.E.
1979–80 'The *Mrzḥ* Tablet from Ugarit,' *Maarav* 2: 187-206.
Fronzaroli, P.
1955 *La leggenda di Aqhat. Testo ugaritico* (Florence: Sansoni).
Frost, H.
1991 'Anchors Sacred and Profane', in Yon 1991: 355-410.

Fulco, W.J.
1976 *The Canaanite God Rešep* (AOS, 8; New Haven: American Oriental Society).
Gadd, C.J.
1948 *Ideas of Divine Rule in the Ancient Near East* (Schweich Lectures; London: The British Academy).
Gallagher, W.R.
1994 'On the Identity of Hêlēl ben Šaḥar of Is. 14:12-15', *UF* 26: 131-46.
Garbini, G.
1990 'Il verbo *adr* in ugaritico', *OA* 29: 57-62.
Gaster, T.H.
1936 'The Story of Aqhat i', *SMSR* 12: 126-49.
1937a 'The Harrowing of Baal: A Poem from Ras Shamra', *AcOr* 16: 41-48.
1937b 'The Story of Aqhat ii', *SMSR* 13: 25-56.
1938 'The Story of Aqhat iii', *SMSR* 14: 212-15.
1944 'Folklore Motifs in Canaanite Myth', *JRAS*: 30-51.
1946 'A Canaanite Ritual Drama: The Spring Festival at Ugarit', *JAOS* 66: 49-76.
1947 'The Canaanite Epic of Keret', *JQR* 37: 285-93.
1950 *Thespis: Ritual, Myth and Drama in the Ancient Near East* (New York: Henry Schuman).
1961 *Thespis: Ritual, Myth and Drama in the Ancient Near East* (Garden City, New York, 2nd edn).
1975 'Sharper than a Serpent's Tooth: A Canaanite Charm against Snakebite', *JANES* 7: 33-51.
Gevirtz, S.
1961 'The Ugaritic Parallel to Jeremiah 8:23', *JNES* 20: 41-46.
Gibson, J.C.L.
1975 'Myth, Legend and Folklore in the Ugaritic Keret and Aqhat Texts', in *Congress Volume, Edinburgh 1974* (VTSup, 28; Leiden: E.J. Brill): 60-68.
1978 *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark).
Gimbutas, M.
1991 *The Civilization of the Goddess* (ed. J. Marler; San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco).
Ginsberg, H.L.
1935 'Birth of the Gracious and Beautiful Gods', *JRAS*: 45-72.
1936 'Ba'lu and his Brethren', *JPOS* 16: 138-49.
1936b *Kitbê Ugarît mêḥqārîm leshônîym*, I (Jerusalem: Bialik).
1936c 'The Rebellion and Death of Ba'lu', *Or* 5: 161-98.
1938 'A Ugaritic Parallel to 2 Sam. 1 21', *JBL* 57: 209-13.
1939 'Two Religious Borrowings in Ugaritic Literature. I. A Hurrian Myth in Semitic Dress', *Or* 8: 317-27.
1945a 'The North-Canaanite Myth of Anath and Aqhat I', *BASOR* 97: 3-10.
1945b 'The North-Canaanite Myth of Anath and Aqhat II', *BASOR* 98: 15-23.
1946 *The Legend of King Keret* (BASORSup, 2-3; South Hadley, MA: American Schools of Oriental Research).
1950 'Interpreting Ugaritic Texts', *JAOS* 70: 156-60.

1969 'Ugaritic Myths, Epics and Legends', in *ANET*: 129-55.
1973 'Ugaritico-Phoenicia', *JANES* 5: 131-47.
Goetze, A.
1941 'The Nikkal Poem from Ras Shamra', *JBL* 60: 353-74.
Good, E.M.
1958 'Two Notes on Aqhat', *JBL* 77: 72-74.
Good, R.M.
1980 'Supplementary Remarks on the Ugaritic Funerary Text RS 34.126', *BASOR* 239: 41-42.
1984 'Some Ugaritic Terms Relating to Draught and Riding Animals', *UF* 16: 77-81.
1985 'Hebrew and Ugaritic *nḥt*', *UF* 17: 153-56.
1991 'On RS 24.252', *UF* 23: 155-60.
1994 'The Sportsman Baal', *UF* 26: 147-63.
Gopher, A., and T. Tsuk
1991 *Ancient Gold: Rare Finds from the Nahal Qanah Cave* (Jerusalem: The Israel Museum).
Gordon, C.H.
1937 'A Marriage of the Gods in Canaanite Mythology', *BASOR* 65: 29-33.
1949 *Ugaritic Literature* (SPIB, 98, Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute).
1953 'Near Eastern Seals in Princeton and Philadelphia', *Or* 22: 242-50.
1969a *Ugaritic Textbook* (AnOr, 38, Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute).
1969b 'Vergil and the Near East', *Ugaritica* 6: 267-88.
1977 'Poetic Legends and Myths from Ugarit', *Berytus* 25: 5-133.
1985 'The Devil, ḥby', *NUS* 33: 15.
1986 '*Ḥby*, Possessor of Horns and Tail', *UF* 18: 129-32.
Grabbe, L.
1976 'The Seasonal Pattern and the "Baal Cycle"', *UF* 8: 57-63.
Graves, R.
1960 *The Greek Myths* (2 vols.; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 3rd edn).
Gray, J.
1951 'The Hunting of Ba'al: Fratricide and Atonement in the Mythology of Ras Shamra', *JNES* 10: 146-51.
1957 *The Legacy of Canaan* (VTSup, 5; Leiden: E.J. Brill; 1965^2).
1964 *The Krt Text in the Literature of Ras Shamra* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2nd edn).
1971 'Ba'al's Atonement', *UF* 3: 61-70.
1978 'Canaanite Religion and Old Testament Study in the Light of New Alphabetic Texts from Ras Shamra', *Ugaritica* 7: 79-108.
Greaves, S.W.
1994 'Wordplay and Associative Magic in the Ugaritic Snake-Bite Incantation RS 24.244', *UF* 26: 165-67.
Greenfield, J.
1994 'Keret's Dream: *ḏhrt* and *hdrt*,' *BSO(A)S* 57: 87-92.
Grønbæk, J.K.
1985 'Baal's Battle with Yam—A Canaanite Creation Fight', *JSOT* 33: 27-44.

Gruber, M.
1980 *Aspects of Non-Verbal Communication in the Ancient Near East* (2 vols.; SP, 12/I, II, Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute).
Gulde, S.
1998 'KTU 1.23—die Beschwörung der *Agzrym bn ym*', *UF* 30: 289-334.
Gurney, O.R.
1968 'An Old Babylonian Treatise on the Tuning of the Harp', *Iraq* 30: 229-32.
Habel, N.C.
1972 'He Who Stretches Out the Heavens', *CBQ* 34: 417-30.
Hallo, W.W. (with J.L. Younger Jr)
1997 *The Context of Scripture*. I. *Canonical Compositions of the Biblical World* (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
Halpern, B.
1979–80 'A Landlord-Tenant Dispute at Ugarit?', *Maarav* 2: 121-40.
Handy, L.K.
1992a 'Dagon', in *ABD*, II: 1-3.
1992b 'Reshef', in *ABD*, V: 678-79.
1994 *Among the Host of Heaven: The Syro-Palestinian Pantheon as Bureaucracy* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns).
Harbison, P.
1988 *Pre-Christian Ireland* (London: Thames & Hudson).
Harrison, J.
1955 *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* (repr., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [1922], 3rd edn).
Hayman, A.P.
1986 'Some Observations on *Sefer Yesira*: (2) The Temple at the Centre of the Universe', *JJS* 37: 176-82.
Healey, J.F.
1976 'Syriac *nṣr*, Ugaritic *nṣr*, Hebrew *nṣr* II, Akkadian *nṣr* II', *VT* 26: 429-37.
1979 'The *Pietas* of an Ideal Son in Ugarit', *UF* 11: 353-356.
1980 'Ugaritic *ḥtk*: A Note', *UF* 12: 408-409.
1985 'The Akkadian "Pantheon List" from Ugarit', *SEL* 2: 115-25.
1995a 'Tirash', in *DDD*: cols. 1642-45.
1995b 'Dagon', in *DDD*: cols. 407-13.
1995c 'Ilib', in *DDD*: cols. 836-40.
1998 'The Kindly and Merciful God. On some Semitic Divine Epithets', in Dietrich and Kottsieper 1998: 349-56.
Heider, G.C.
1985 *The Cult of Molek: A Reassessment* (JSOTSup, 43; Sheffield: JSOT Press).
Held, M.
1954 'A Difficult Biblical Expression and its Parallel in Ugaritic' (Heb.), *EI* 3: 101-103.
Heltzer, M.
1982 *The Internal Organization of the Kingdom of Ugarit* (Wiesbaden: Dr Ludwig Reichert Verlag).

Hendel, R.S.
1987 *The Epic of the Patriarch: The Jacob Cycle and the Narrative Traditions of Canaan and Israel* (HSM, 42; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
Herdner, A.
1949 'Ḫiriḫibi et les noces de Yarih et de Nikkal', *Semitica* 2: 17-20.
1956 'Un nouvel exemplaire du rituel RS 1929, no. 3', *Syria* 33: 104-12.
1972 'Une prière à Baal des ugaritains en danger', *CRAIBL* 72: 693-97.
1974 See Caquot, Sznycer and Herdner 1974.
1978 'Nouveaux textes alphabétiques de Ras Shamra—XXIV[e] campagne 1961', *Ugaritica* 7: 1-74.
Herr, B.
1995 'Die Vorgeschichte des Baal-Mythos. Ein Vorschlag zu KTU 1.1-1.6', *UF* 27: 41-58.
Herrmann, W.
1968 *Yariḫ und Nikal und der Preis der Kuṯarāt-Göttinnen* (BZAW, 106; Berlin: de Gruyter).
1969 'Aštart', *MIO* 15: 6-55.
1995a 'El', in *DDD*: cols. 522-33.
1995b 'Baal Zebub', in *DDD*: cols. 293-96.
Hettema, T.L.
1989–90 '"That it be repeated": A Narrative Analysis of KTU 1.23', *JEOL* 31: 77-94.
L'Heureux, C.
1979 *Rank among the Canaanite Gods: El, Ba'al and the Repha'îm* (HSM, 21; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press).
Hoffmeier, J.K.
1997 'King Lists', in Hallo 1997: 68-73.
Hoffner, H.A.
1990 *Hittite Myths* (SBLWAWS, 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
Hoftijzer, J.
1971 'A Note on G 1083[3]: *'išt'ir* and Related Matters', *UF* 3: 361-64.
Hoftijzer, J., and K. Jongeling
1994 *Dictionary of North-West Semitic Inscriptions* (HOS, 21; Leiden: E.J. Brill).
Holloway, S.
1998 'KTU 1.162 and the offering of a shield', *UF* 30: 353-61.
Huffmon, H.B.
1995 'Shalem', in *DDD*: cols. 1428-31.
Husser, J.-M.
1994 *Le songe et la parole. Etude sur le rêve et sa fonction dans l'ancien Israël* (BZAW, 210; Berlin: de Gruyter).
1995 'Culte des ancêtres ou rites funéraires? A propos du 'catalogue' des devoirs du fils (KTU 1.17: i-ii)', *UF* 27: 115-27.
1996 'The Birth of a Hero: Form and Meaning of KTU 1.17 i-ii', in Wyatt, Watson and Lloyd (eds.) 1996: 85-98.
1997 'Shapash psychopompe et le pseudo hymne au soleil (KTU 1.6 vi 42-53)', *UF* 29: 227-44.

Hvidberg, F.F.
1962 *Weeping and Laughter in the Old Testament* (trans. N. Haislund; Copenhagen: Arnold Busck).
Iwry, S.
1961 'New Evidence for Belomancy in Ancient Palestine and Phoenicia', *JAOS* 81: 27-34.
Jackson, J.J.
1974 'Style in Isaiah 28 and a Drinking Bout of the Gods (RS 24.258)', in J.J. Jackson and M. Kessler (eds.), *Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg* (Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press): 85-98.
Jackson, J.J., and H.H.P. Dressler
1975 'El and the Cup of Blessing', *JAOS* 95: 99-101.
Jacobsen, T.
1976 *The Treasures of Darkness: A History of Mesopotamian Religion* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
Jaynes, J.
1982 *The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin; paperback of 1976 edition, with new preface).
Jeffers, A.
1996 *Magic and Divination in Ancient Palestine and Syria* (SHCANE, 8; Leiden: E.J. Brill).
Jirku, A.
1962 *Kanaanäische Mythen und Epen aus Ras Schamra-Ugarit* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus).
Johnstone, W.
1969 'Old Testament Technical Expressions in Property Holding: Contributions from Ugarit', *Ugaritica* 6: 309-17.
1978 'Lexical and Comparative Philological Contributions to Ugaritic of the Mythological Texts of the 24th Campaign at Ras Shamra', *Ugaritica* 7: 109-19.
De Jong, T., and W.H. van Soldt
1989 'Redating an Early Solar Eclipse Record (KTU 1.78): Implications for the Ugaritic Calendar and for the Secular Accelerations of the Earth and Moon', *JEOL* 30: 65-77.
Kapelrud, A.S.
1969 'Baal and the Devourers', *Ugaritica* 6: 319-32.
Kemp, B.J.
1989 *Ancient Egypt: Anatomy of a Civilization* (London: Routledge)
Kitchen, K.A.
1977 'The King-List of Ugarit', *UF* 9: 131-42.
Klengel, H.
1965–69 *Geschichte Syriens im 2. Jahrtausend v.u.Z.* (DAWIOV, 40 and 70; 2 vols.; Berlin: Akademie Verlag).
1979 *Geschichte und Kultur Altsyriens* (Leipzig: Koehler und Amelang).
1992 *Syria 3000 to 300 BC: A Handbook of Political History* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag).

Koch, K.
1967 'Die Sohneverheissung an den ugaritischen Daniel', *ZA* 24: 211-21.
Korpel, M.C.A.
1990 *A Rift in the Clouds: Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine* (UBL, 8: Münster: Ugarit-Verlag).
1996 'Avian Spirits in Ugarit and in Ezekiel 13', in Wyatt, Watson and Lloyd, 1996: 99-113.
Kottsieper, I.
1984 'KTU 1.100. Versuch einer Deutung', *UF* 16: 97-110.
Kruger, P.
1995 'Rank Symbolism in the Baal Epic: Some Further Indicators', *UF* 27: 169-75.
Kuhrt, A.
1995 *The Ancient Near East c. 3000–330 BC* (Routledge History of the Ancient World; 2 vols.; London: Routledge).
Kutscher, R.
1986 'Akkadian *śadādum*/ *šadādum* = "to camp"', *ZA* 76: 1-3.
Lambert, W.G.
1984 'The Identity of the Eblaite God NIdaKUL', *OA* 23: 43-44.
1985 'The Pair Laḫmu—Laḫamu in Cosmology', *Orientalia* 54: 189-202.
Landsberger, B.
1949 'Jahreszeiten im Sumerisch-Akkadischen', *JNES* 8: 248-97.
Largement, R.
1949 *La naissance de l'Aurore. Poème mythologique de Ras Shamra-Ugarit* (ALBO, II 2; Paris: Gembloux).
Laroche, E.
1968 'Documents hourrites de Ras Shamra', *Ugaritica* 5: 448-544.
Leclant, J.
1960 'Astarté à cheval d'après les représentations égyptiennes', *Syria* 37: 1-67.
Leibovitch, J.
1961 'Kent et Qadech', *Syria* 38: 23-34.
Levine, B.A.
1983 'The Descriptive Ritual Texts from Ugarit: Some Formal and Functional Features of the Genre', in C.L. Meyers and M. O'Connor (eds.), *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of D.N. Freedman in Celebration of his Sixtieth Birthday* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns): 467-75.
1993 *Numbers 1-20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 4a; New York: Doubleday).
Levine, B.A., and J.-M. de Tarragon
1984 'Dead Kings and Rephaim: The Patrons of the Ugaritic Dynasty', *JAOS* 104: 649-59.
1988 '"Shapshu cries out in heaven": Dealing with Snake-Bites at Ugarit (*KTU* 1.100, 1.107)', *RB* 95: 481-518.
1993 'The King Proclaims the Day: Ugaritic Rites for the Vintage (KTU 1.41//1.87)', *RB* 100: 76-115.
Levine, B.A., J.-M. de Tarragon and A. Robertson
1997a 'Ugaritic Rites for the Vintage', in Hallo 1997: 299-301.

1997b 'The Patrons of the Ugaritic Dynasty (KTU 1.161)', in Hallo 1997: 357-58.

Levine, E.

1986 'What is a Land Flowing with Milk and Honey?', in L.D. Muñoz (ed.), *Salvación en la palabra: Targum–Derash–Berit. En memoire del profesor Alejandro Díez Macho* (Madrid: Cristiandad): 193-204.

Lévi-Strauss, C.

1964 *Le cru et le cuit* (Paris: Plon).

1977 *Structural Anthropology* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books).

Lewis, T.J.

1989 *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit* (HSM, 39; Atlanta: Scholars Press).

1996a 'Toward a Literary Translation of the Rapiuma Texts', in Wyatt, Watson and Lloyd, 1996: 115-49.

1996b 'The Disappearance of the Goddess Anat: The 1995 West Semitic Research Project on Ugaritic Epigraphy', *BA* 59: 115-21.

1996c '*CT* 13.33-34 and Ezekiel 32: Lion-Dragon Myths', *JAOS* 116: 28-47.

Lichtheim, M.

1997 'The Destruction of Mankind', in Hallo 1997: 36-37.

Lindenberger, J.M.

1983 *The Aramaic Proverbs of Aḥiqar* (Johns Hopkins Near Eastern Studies; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press).

Lipiński, E.

1965 'Les conceptions et les couches merveilleuses de 'Anat', *Syria* 42: 45-63.

1971a 'El's Abode: Mythological Traditions Related to Mt. Hermon and the Mountains of Armenia', *OLP* 2: 13-69.

1971b 'Epiphanie de Baal-Haddu. RS 24.245', *UF* 3: 80-92.

1974 'La légende sacrée de la conjuration des morsures de serpents', *UF* 6: 169-74.

1978 'Ditānu', in Y. Avishur and J. Blau (eds.), *Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East Presented to Samuel E. Loewenstamm on his 70th Birthday* (Jerusalem: Rubinstein): 91-110.

1986 'Fertility Cult in Ancient Ugarit', in Bonanno 1986: 207-15.

Liverani, M.

1962 *Storia di Ugarit nell'eta; degli archivi politici* (SS, 6; Rome: Centro di Studi Semitici).

1969 'Review of *Ugaritica* 5', *OA* 8: 338-40.

1974 'La royauté syrienne de l'âge de bronze récent', in P. Garelli (ed.), *Le palais et la royauté* (XIX^{e} Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale; Paris: Geuthner): 329-56.

Livingstone, A.

1995 'Image', in *DDD*: cols. 840-43.

Lloyd, J.B.

1990 'The Banquet Theme in Ugaritic Narrative', *UF* 22: 169-93.

1994 'The Goddess Anat: An Examination of the Textual and Iconographic Evidence from the Second Millennium BC' (dissertation, University of Edinburgh).

1996 'Anat and the "Double" Massacre in KTU 1.3 ii', in Wyatt, Watson and Lloyd, 1996: 151-65.

Lloyd, J.B., and N. Wyatt

1995 'Ugaritic Past and Present: Aspects of a Cuneiform Alphabet', *Cosmos* 11: 33-54.

Loewenstamm, S.E.

1962 'The Ugaritic Fertility Myth—The Result of a Mistranslation', *IEJ* 12: 87-88.

1969 'Eine lehrhafte ugaritsche Trinkburlesque', *UF* 1: 71-78.

1971a 'Grenzgebiete ugaritischer Sprach- und Stilvergleichung: Hebräisch des Zweiten Tempels, Mittelhebräisch, Griechisch', *UF* 3: 93-100.

1971b '*Mṣd*', *UF* 3: 357-59.

1972 'The Killing of Mot in the Ugaritic Texts', *Or* 41: 378-82.

1974 'Did the Goddess Anat Wear a Beard and Side-Whiskers?', *IOS* 4: 1-3.

1975a 'Ugarit and the Bible', *Biblica* 56: 103-19.

1975b 'The Making and Destruction of the Golden Calf—A Rejoinder', *Biblica* 56: 330-43.

1982 'Did the Goddess Anat Wear Side-Whiskers and a Beard?: A Reconsideration', *UF* 14: 119-22.

Loretz, O.

1980 'Der kanaanäische Ursprung des biblischen Gottesnamens *El Šaddaj*', *UF* 12: 420-1.

1993 'Ugaritisch-Hebräisch "Pflugschar" (*mḥrṯt/*mḥršh*)', *SEL* 10: 71-78.

1995 'Ugaritische Lexikographie', *SEL* 12: 105-20.

1996 'A Hurrian Word (*ṯkt*) for the Chariot of the Cloud-Rider? (KTU 1.4 v 6-9)', in Wyatt, Watson and Lloyd 1996: 167-78.

— See also under M. Dietrich and O. Loretz (and J. Sanmartín)

Loretz, O., and P. Xella

1982 'Beschwörung und Krankheilung in RIH 78/20', *MLE* 1: 37-46.

Macintosh, A.A.

1969 'A Consideration of Hebrew *g'r*', *VT* 19: 471-79.

Malamat, A.

1989 *Mari and the Early Israelite Experience* (The Schweich Lectures; London: The British Academy).

Mallet, J.

1987 'Le temple aux rhytons', in Yon 1987: 213-48.

Mallowan, M.

1970 'The Development of Cities from Al-'Ubaid to the End of Uruk 5', in Edwards, Gadd and Hammond 1970: 327-462.

Malul, M.

1986 'Some Comments on B. Margalit's "Ugaritic Lexicography II"', *RB* 93: 415-18.

Marcus, D.

1977 'The Term "Chin" in the Semitic Languages', *BASOR* 226: 53-60.

Margalit, B. (= B. Margulis)

1970a 'A Ugaritic Psalm (RŠ 24.252)', *JBL* 89: 292-304.

1970b 'A New Ugaritic Farce', *UF* 2: 131-38.

1971 'A Weltbaum in Ugaritic Literature?', *JBL* 90: 481-82.

1974 'Weltbaum and Weltberg in Ugaritic Literature: Notes and Observations on RŠ 24.245', *ZAW* 86: 1-22.
1976 'Studia Ugaritica II', *UF* 8: 136-92.
1979 'Alliteration in Ugaritic Poetry', *UF* 11: 537-57.
1979–80 'The Ugaritic Feast of the Drunken Gods: Another Look at RS 24.258 (KTU 1.114)', *Maarav* 2: 65-120.
1980 *A Matter of "Life" and "Death": A Study of the Baal-Mot Epic (CTA 4-5-6)* (AOAT, 206; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag: Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker).
1981 'The Geographical Setting of the Aqhat Story and its Ramifications', in G.D. Young 1981: 131-58.
1982a 'The Ugaritic Feast of the Drunken Gods: Another Look at RS 24.258 (*KTU* 1.114)', *Maarav* 2: 65-120.
1982b 'The Episode of the Fleece (Judges 6.36-46) in the Light of Ugaritic', *Shnaton* 5-6: lv-lxii.
1983a 'Ugaritic Lexicography II', *RB* 90: 556-62.
1983b 'Lexicographical Notes on the Aqhat Epic (Part I: KTU 1.17-18)', *UF* 15: 65-103.
1983c 'A Restoration Proposal in *AQHT* (CTA/KTU 1.17: VI: 45)', *RB* 90: 360-64.
1984a 'KTU 1.93, the Prayer of a Sick Cow', *SEL* 1: 89-101.
1984b 'The "Neolithic Connexion" of the Ugaritic Poem of Aqhat', *Paléorient* 9: 93-98.
1984c 'Lexicographical Notes on the Aqhat Epic (Part II: KTU 1.19)', *UF* 16: 119-79.
1989a *The Ugaritic Poem of Aqht* (BZAW, 182, Berlin: de Gruyter).
1989b 'KTU 1.92 (Obv.): A Ugaritic Theophagy', *AuOr* 7: 67-80.
1995 'K-R-T Studies', *UF* 27: 215-315.
1996 'Ugaritic *ʻṯtr ʻrẓ* and DAPT (I 14) *šgr.w'štr*', in Wyatt, Watson and Lloyd, 1996: 179-203.
1999 'The Epic Poem of Keret', in W.G.E. Watson and N. Wyatt (eds.), *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies* (Handbuch der Orientalistik; Leiden: E.J. Brill): 201-33.

Margulis, B.
See under B. Margalit.

Marks, J.H., and R.M. Good (eds.)
1987 *Love and Death in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Marvin H. Pope* (Guilford, CT: Four Quarters).

Mayer, W.R.
1989 'Akkadische Lexicographie: *CAD* Q III Babylonisch', *Or* 58: 267-75.

Mayer-Opificius, R.
1983 'Rekonstruktion des Thrones des Fürsten Idrimi von Alalah', *UF* 15: 119-26.

Mazzini, G.
1997 'The Torture of Mot. For a Reading of KTU 1.6 V 30-35', *SEL* 14: 23-28.

McCurley, F.R.
1983 *Ancient Myths and Biblical Faith* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).

McKenna, T.
1992 *Food of the Gods* (London: Rider).
McLaughlin, J.L.
1991 'The *marzeaḥ* at Ugarit', *UF* 23: 265-81.
McLeod, W.
1970 *Composite Bows from the Tomb of Tut'ankhamūn* (TTS, 3 Oxford: Oxford University Press).
1982 *Self Bows and Other Archery Tackle from the Tomb of Tut'ankhamūn* (TTS, 4: Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Meier, S.
1986 'Baal's Fight with Yam (KTU 1.2.I, IV): A Part of the Baal Myth as Known in KTU 1.1, 3-6?', *UF* 18: 241-54.
Mellaart, J.
1970 (a) 'The Earliest Settlements in Western Asia from the Ninth to the End of the fifth Millennium BC (b) Anatolia before 4000 BC', in Edwards, Gadd, Hammond 1970: 248-326.
Merrill, A.L.
1968 'The House of Keret: A Study of the Keret Legend', *SEÅ* 33: 5-17.
Du Mesnil de Buisson, R.
1963 'Origine et évolution du panthéon de Tyr', *RHR* 164: 133-63.
Metzger, M.
1985 *Königsthron und Gottesthron. Thronformen und Throndarstellungen in Ägypten und im Vorderen Orient im dritten und zweiten Jahrtausend vor Christus und deren Bedeutung für das Verständnis von Aussagen über den Thron im Alten Testament* (AOAT, 15: 2 vols.: Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker).
Meyers, E.M. (ed.)
1997 *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of Archaeology in the Near East* (5 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Milgrom, J.
1972 'The Alleged Wave-Offering in Israel and the Ancient Near East', *IEJ* 22: 33-38.
Milik, J.T.
1958 'Giobbe 38, 28 in siro-palestinese e la dea ugaritica *pdry bt ar*', *RivB* 6: 252-54.
Millard, A.R.
1997 'Assyrian King Lists', in Hallo 1997, 463-65.
Miller, P.D.
1970 'Animal Names and Designations in Ugaritic and Hebrew', *UF* 2: 177-86.
Mironov, N.D.
1933 'Aryan Vestiges in the Near East in the Second Millenary BC', *AcOr* 11: 140-217.
Mithen, S.
1996 *The Prehistory of the Mind* (London: Thames & Hudson).
Montgomery, J.A.
1938 '*Yām Sûf* ("the Red Sea") = *Ultimum Mare*?', *JAOS* 58: 131-32.

Montgomery, J.A., and H.S. Gehman
1951 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark).
Moor, J.C. de
1965 'Frustula ugaritica', *JNES* 24: 355-64.
1968 'Murices in Ugaritic Mythology', *Or* 37: 212-15.
1969a 'Studies in the New Alphabetic Texts from Ras Shamra', *UF* 1: 167-88.
1969b Review of F. Gröndahl, *Die Personennamen den Texte aus Ugarit* (SP, 1; Rome: Pontifical Biblical institute, 1967), *BibOr* 26: 105-108.
1970a 'The Semitic Pantheon of Ugarit', *UF* 2: 187-228.
1970b 'Studies in the New Alphabetic Texts from Ras Shamra II', *UF* 2: 303-27.
1970c 'B. Margulis on RŠ 24.258', *UF* 2: 347-50.
1971a *The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Poem of Ba'lu according to the Version of Ilimilku* (AOAT, 16; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker).
1971b 'The Ash in Ugarit', *UF* 3: 349-50.
1972 *New Year with Canaanite and Israelites* (2 vols.; Kampen: Kok).
1973 'Ugaritic Lexicography', in P. Fronzaroli (ed.), *Studies in Semitic Lexicography* (QS, 2; Florence: Istituto di Linguistica e di Lingue Orientali).
1975 '*'ar* "Honey-Dew"', *UF* 7: 590-91.
1976 'Rapiuma—Rephaim', *ZAW* 88: 323-45.
1979 'Contributions to the Ugaritic Lexicon', *UF* 11: 639-53.
1980a 'An Incantation against Infertility (KTU 1. 13)', *UF* 12: 305-10.
1980b 'An Incantation against Evil Spirits (Ras Ibn Hani 78/20)', *UF* 12: 429-32.
1981–82 'Demons in Canaan', *JEOL* 27: 106-19.
1984 'Henbane and KTU 1.114', *UF* 16: 355-56.
1985a "Athtartu the Huntress (KTU 1. 92)', *UF* 17: 225-30.
1985b 'The Ancestral Cult in KTU 1.17: I.26-28', *UF* 17: 407-409.
1986 'Ugaritic Lexicographical Notes i', *UF* 18: 255-61.
1987 *An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit* (Nisaba, 16; Leiden: E.J. Brill).
1988a 'East of Eden', *ZAW* 100: 105-11.
1988b 'The Seasonal Pattern in the Legend of Aqhatu', *SEL* 5: 61-78.
1990 *The Rise of Yahwism: The Roots of Israelite Monotheism* (BETL, 91; Leuven: Peeters).
1995 'Standing Stones and Ancestor Worship', *UF* 27: 1-20.
de Moor, J.C., and P. Sanders
1991 'An Ugaritic Expiation Ritual and its Old Testament Parallels', *UF* 23: 283-300.
de Moor J.C., and K. Spronk
1982a 'Problematic Passages in the Legend of Kirtu (I)', *UF* 14: 153-71.
1982b 'Problematic Passages in the Legend of Kirtu (II)', *UF* 14: 173-90.
1987 *A Cuneiform Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit* (SSS, 6; Leiden: E.J. Brill).

Moore, M.S.
1990 *The Balaam Traditions. Their Character and Development* (SBLDS, 113; Atlanta,GA: Scholars Press).
Morgan, L.
1995 'Minoan Painting and Egypt: The Case of Tell el-Dab'a', in W.V. Davies and L. Schofield (eds.), *Egypt, the Aegean and the Levant: Interconnections in the Second Millennium BC* (London: British Museum Press): 29-53.
Moscati, S.
1988 *Les Phéniciens* (ed. P. Aimet; Milan: Bompiani).
Mowinckel, S.
1941 'Immanuelsprofetien Jes. 7. Streiflys fra Ugarit', *NorTT*: 129-58.
Mussies, G.
1995 'Jezebel', in *DDD*: cols. 889-92.
Neiman, D.
1977 'Gihôn and Pishôn: Mythological Antecedents of the Two Enigmatic Rivers of Eden', in *Proceedings of the 6th Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies): 321-28.
Neu, E.
1995 'Hethitisch zapzagi-', *UF* 27: 395-402.
al Noori, K.A.
1994 '*Yam, the Sea-God, in the Ugaritic Texts*' (dissertation, University of Manchester).
Noth, M.
1966 'Old Testament Covenant-Making in the Light of a Text from Mari', in M. North (ed.), *The Laws of the Pentateuch and Other Essays* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd).
Nougayrol, J.
1955 *Textes accadiens et hourrites des archives est, ouest et centrales* (PRU, 3; Paris: Imprimerie Nationale).
1968a 'Textes suméro-accadiens des archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit. Textes religieux §18—RS 20. 24 ("Panthéon d'Ugarit")', *Ugaritica* 5: 42-64.
1968b 'Textes suméro-accadiens des archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit. Textes juridiques', *Ugaritica* 5: 172-87.
1968c 'Achats de terre de la reine d'Ugarit', *Ugaritica* 5: 261-64.
Obermann, J.
1936 'An Antiphonal Psalm from Ras Shamra', *JBL* 55: 21-44.
1946 *How Daniel Was Blessed With a Son: An Incubation Scene in Ugaritic* (JAOSSup, 6; New Haven: Yale University Press).
1947 'How Baal Destroyed a Rival: A Mythological Incantation Scene', *JAOS* 67: 195-208.
1948 *Ugaritic Mythology: A Study of its Leading Motifs* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
O'Callaghan, R.T.
1948 *Aram Naharaim* (AnOr, 26; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute).
1952 'The Word *ktp* in Ugaritic and Egypto-Canaanite Mythology', *Or* 21: 37-46.

O'Flaherty, W.D.
1975 *Hindu Myths: A Sourcebook Translated from Sanskrit* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books).
Oldenburg, U.
1969 *The Conflict between El and Ba'al in Canaanite Religion* (*Numen* Supplements second series, 3; Leiden: E.J. Brill).
Olivier, J.P.
1971 'Notes on the Ugaritic Month Names', *JNSL* 1: 39-45.
1972 'Notes on the Ugaritic Month Names ii', *JNSL* 2: 53-59.
Olmo Lete, G. del
1975 'Notes on Ugaritic semantics I', *UF* 7: 89-102.
1976 'Notas de semántica ugarítica II', *AF* 2: 227-51.
1981a *Mitos y leyendas de Canaan* (Fuentes de la Ciencia Biblica, 1, Madrid: Eds. Cristiandad).
1981b 'Le mythe de la vierge-mère 'Anatu: une nouvelle interprétation de CTA/KTU 13', *UF* 13: 49-62.
1982 'Notes on Ugaritic Semantics V', *UF* 14: 55-69.
1983a 'Aṯiratu's Entreaty and the Order of the Ugaritic Tablets KTU 1.3/4', *AuOr* 1: 67-71.
1983b 'El mito de Ba'lu: prosodia y hermenéutica', *AuOr* 1: 167-78.
1984 *Interpretación de la mitología cananea* (Fuentes de la Ciencia Biblica, 2; Valencia: Institución San Jerónimo).
1987a 'Los nombres "divinos" de los reyes de Ugarit', *AuOr* 5: 39-69.
1987b 'Liturgia ugarítica del primer mes (KTU 1.41//1.87)', *AuOr* 5: 257-70.
1988 'Ug. *ṯ*, *ṯy*, *ṯt*: nombre divino y acción cultual', *UF* 20: 27-33.
1989a 'El sacrificio de expiación nacional en Ugarit (KTU 1.40 y par.)', in *La paraula en serveis dels homes: XXV Jornades de biblistes catalans* (Barcelona: Associació Bíblica de Catalunya): 46-56.
1989b 'Litúrgia sacrificial y salmodia en Ugarit (KTU 1.119)', *AuOr* 7: 27-35.
1990 'Un *mšr* (KTU 1.40) y el edicto *mišarum*', *AuOr* 8: 130-33.
1991 '*Yarḫu* y *Nikkalu*. La mitología lunar sumeria en Ugarit', *AuOr* 9: 67-75.
1992a *La religión cananea según la litúrgia de Ugarit* (AuOrSup, 3; Sabadell: Editorial AUSA).
1992b 'Receta mágica para un enfante enfermo (KTU 1.124)', *Sefarad* 52: 187-92.
1992c 'Un conjuro ugarítico contra el "mal ojo" (KTU 1.96)', *AF* 15: 7-16.
1992d 'The Divine Panoply (KTU 1.65: 12-14)', *AuOr* 10: 254-56.
1995 'The Sacrificial Vocabulary at Ugarit', *SEL* 12: 37-49.
1999 *Canaanite Religion According to the Liturgical Texts of Ugarit* (Bethesda, MD: CDL Press; ET of 1992a).
del Olmo Lete, G., and M.E. Aubet (eds.)
1986 *Los Fenicios en la Peninsula Ibérica* (2 vols.; Sabadell: Editorial AUSA).
Olrik, A.
1909 'Epische Gesetze der Volksdichtung', *ZDA* 51: 1-12.
L'Orange, H.P.
1953 *Studies in the Iconography of Cosmic Kingship* (Oslo: Aschehoug).

Page, H.R., Jr
1996 *The Myth of Cosmic Rebellion. A Study of its Reflexes in Ugaritic and Biblical Literature* (VTSup, 65; Leiden: E.J. Brill).
Pardee, D.
1973 'A Note on the Root *'tq* in CTA 16 I 2,5 (UT 125, KRT II)', *UF* 5: 229-34.
1977 'An Emendation in the Ugaritic Aqhat Text', *JNES* 36: 53-56.
1978a 'A Philological and Prosodic Analysis of the Ugaritic Serpent Incantation *UT* 607', *JANES* 10: 73-108.
1978b 'The Semitic Root *mrr* and the Etymology of Ugaritic *mr(r)* || *brk**', *UF* 10: 249-88.
1983 'Visiting Ditanu: The Text of RS 24.272', *UF* 15: 127-40.
1984 'Will the Dragon Never be Muzzled?', *UF* 16: 251-55.
1986 'The Ugaritic *šumma izbu* Text', *AfO* 33: 117-47.
1988a *Les textes paramythologiques de la 24e campagne (1961)* (RSO, 4; Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations).
1988b *Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic Parallelism: A Trial Cut* ('nt *I and Proverbs 2*) (VTSup, 39; Leiden: E.J. Brill).
1989–90 'Ugaritic Proper Names', *AfO* 36-37: 390-513.
1991 'The Structure of RS 1.002', in A.S. Kaye (ed.) *Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau on the Occasion of his Eighty-Fifth Birthday November 14th, 1991* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
1992 'RS 24.263: texte et structure', *Syria* 69: 153-70.
1993 'RS 1.005 and the Identification of the *gṯrm*', in J. Quaegebeur (ed.), *Ritual and Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East* (OLA, 55; Leuven: Peeters): 301-17.
1993b 'Poetry in Ugaritic Ritual Texts', in J.C. de Moor and W.G.E. Watson (eds.), *Verse in Ancient Near Eastern Prose* (AOAT, 42: Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker).
1995 'Kosharoth', in *DDD*: cols. 915-17.
1996 '*Marzihu*, *Kispu* and the Ugaritic Funerary Cult: A Minimalist View', in Wyatt, Watson and Lloyd 1996: 273-87.
1997a 'Gezer Calendar', in Meyers 1997, II: 400-401.
1997b 'Ugaritic Inscriptions', in Meyers 1997, V: 264-66.
1997c 'West Semitic Canonical Compositions', in Hallo 1997: 239-375.
1997d Review of G. Brooke *et al.*, *Ugarit and the Bible* (UBL 11; Münster 1994), *JAOS* 117: 375-78.
2000 *Les Textes Rituels* (2 vols.: RSO 12; Paris: ERC).
2001a *The Ritual Texts* (SBLWAW; Atlanta: Scholars Press). (Pp. cited are from proofs.)
2001b Review of Parker 1997, *JNES* 60: 142-45.
Pardee D., and N. Swerdlow
1993 'Not the Earliest Solar Eclipse', *Nature* 363: 406.
Parker, S.B.
1970 'The Feast of Rapi'u', *UF* 2: 243-49.
1972 'The Ugaritic Deity Rāpi'u', *UF* 4: 97-102.
1977 'The Historical Composition of *KRT* and the Cult of El', *ZAW* 89: 161-75.

1979 'The Vow in Ugaritic and Israelite Literature', *UF* 11: 693-700.
1979–80 'Some Methodological Principles in Ugaritic Philology', *Maarav* 2: 7-41.
1987 'Death and Devotion: The Composition and Theme of Aqhat', in Marks and Good 1987: 71-83.
1988 'The Birth Announcement', in Eslinger and Taylor 1988: 133-49.
1989 *The Prebiblical Narrative Tradition: Essays in the Ugaritic Poems* Keret *and* Aqhat (SBLRBS, 24; Atlanta: Scholars Press).

Parker, S.B. (ed.)
1997 *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* (SBLWAW; Atlanta: Scholars Press).

Parpola, S.
1993 'The Assyrian Tree of Life: Tracing the Origins of Jewish Monotheism and Greek Philosophy', *JNES* 52: 161-208.

Patai, R.
1947 *Man and Temple in Ancient Jewish Myth and Ritual* (London: Thomas Nelson).

Paul, S.
1968 'Cuneiform Light on Jer. 9.20', *Biblica* 49: 373-76.

Pedersen, J.
1941 'Die KRT Legende', *Berytus* 6: 63-105.

Petersen, D.L., and M. Woodward
1977 'Northwest Semitic Religion: A Study in Relational Structures', *UF* 9: 233-48.

Pitard, W.T.
1978 'The Ugaritic Funerary Text RS 34.126', *BASOR* 232: 65-75.
1987 'RS 34.126: Notes on the Text', *Maarav* 4: 75-86, 111-55.
1992 'A New Edition of the "Rāpi'ūma" Texts: *KTU* 1.20-22', *BASOR* 285: 33-77.
1994a 'The "Libation" Installations of the Tombs at Ugarit', *BA* 57: 20-37.
1994b 'The Reading of KTU 1.19: III: 41: The Burial of Aqhat', *BASOR* 293: 31-38.
1999a 'KTU 1.83, The Binding of Yamm: A New Edition of the Text', *JNES* 57: 261-83.
1999b 'The *Rpum* Texts', in Watson and Wyatt 1999: 259-69.

Pope, M.H.
1955 *El in the Ugaritic texts* (VTsup 2; Leiden: E.J. Brill).
1971 'A Description of Baal', *UF* 3: 117-30.
1972 'A Divine Banquet at Ugarit', in J.M. Efird (ed.), *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays: Studies in Honor of W.F. Stinespring* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press): 170-203.
1977a *Song of Songs* (AB, 7c; New York: Doubleday).
1977b 'Notes on the Rephaim Texts from Ugarit', *MCAAS* 19: 163-82.
1979 'Ups and Downs in El's Amours', *UF* 11: 701-708.
1981 'The Cult of the Dead in Ugarit', in Young 1981: 159-82.

Pope, M.H., and J.H. Tigay
1971 'A Description of Baal', *UF* 3: 117-30.

Porter, J.R.
1978 'The Daughters of Lot', *Folklore* 89: 127-41.

Puech, E.
1993 'Le vocable d'*Aṯtart ḫurri—'štrt ḥr* à Ugarit et en Phénicie', *UF* 25: 327-30.
1995 'Milcom', in *DDD*: cols. 1076-80.
Rabe, N.
1995 'Des Beters vergessende rechte Hand. Zur Textkritik und Übersetzung von Ps 137,5', *UF* 27: 429-53.
Rainey, A.F.
1971 'Observations on Ugaritic Grammar', *UF* 3: 151-72.
1974 'The Ugaritic Texts in *Ugaritica* 5', *JAOS* 94: 184-89.
Ratner, R., and B. Zuckerman
1986 '"A kid in milk?": New Photographs of KTU 1.23, Line 14', *HUCA* 57: 15-60.
Reiter, K.
1990 'Falknerei in Ugarit', *UF* 22: 271-78.
Reiter, K., and R. Plöchl
1993 'SMN 2559: das Geisterwort alaš = "Kupfer/Bronze"', *NABU* 1993/3: 72-73 §86.
Renfroe, F.
1987 'The Transition from "Army" to "Enemy"', *UF* 19: 231-33.
1992 *Arabic-Ugaritic Lexical Studies* (ALASP, 5; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag).
Richardson, M.E.J.
1973 'Ugaritic Spelling Errors', *TynBul* 24: 3-20.
Riley, G.J.
1995 'Demon', in *DDD*: cols. 445-55.
Rin, S.
1968 *Alilot ha Elim* (Jerusalem: Iblan).
Ritner, R.K.
1997 'The Legend of Astarte and the Tribute of the Sea', in Hallo 1997: 35-36.
Robertson
1964 'The "Urim and Tummim": What Were They?', *VT* 14: 67-74.
Rosenthal, F.
1939 'Die Parallelstellen in den Texten von Ugarit', *Or* 8: 213-37.
Rothenberg, B.
1972 *Timna, Valley of the Biblical Copper Mines* (London: Thames & Hudson).
Rouillard, H.
1995 'Rephaim', in *DDD*: cols. 1307-24.
Rütersworden, U.
1995 'Horon', in *DDD*: cols. 805-808.
Saadé, G.
1979 *Ougarit, métropole cananéenne* (Lattakia; Beirut: Imprimérie Catholique).
Saliba, G.
1972 'A Cure for King Keret (Il K, col. vi, 1-13)', *JAOS* 92: 107-10.
Sanmartín, J.
1978 'Zur Ug. Basis *nṣr*', *UF* 10: 451-52.
1980 'Glossen zum ugaritischen Lexikon (IV)', *UF* 12: 335-38.

— See also under M. Dietrich, O. Loretz and J. Sanmartín

Saracino, F.

1982 'Ras Ibn Hani 78/20 and Some OT Connections', *VT* 32: 429-32.

1983a 'Un parallelo elegaico a KTU 1.119.26-36', *UF* 15: 304-306.

1983b 'A State of Siege: Mi 5 4-5 and an Ugaritic Prayer', *ZAW* 95: 263-69.

1984 'Appunti in margine a RIH 78/20', *SEL* 1: 69-83.

Sarna, N.

1957 'Epic Substratum in the Prose of Job', *JBL* 76: 13-25.

Sasson, J.M.

1981 'Literary Criticism, Folklore Scholarship, and Ugaritic Literature', in Young 1981: 81-98.

1988 'The Numeric Progression in Keret I: 15-20: Yet Another Suggestion', *SEL* 5: 181-88.

Sauren H., and G. Kestemont

1971 'Keret, roi de Ḫubur', *UF* 3: 181-221.

Sawyer, J.F.A., and F.R. Stephenson

1970 'Literary and Astronomical Evidence for a Total Eclipse of the Sun Observed in Ancient Ugarit on 3 May 1375 BC', *BSO(A)S* 33: 467-89.

Schaeffer, C.F.-A.

1939a *The Cuneiform Texts of Ras Shamra-Ugarit* (The Schweich Lectures; London: The British Academy).

1939b 'Matériaux pour l'étude de la formation de l'art syrien du deuxième millénaire', *Ugaritica* 1: 126-43.

1966 'Nouveaux témoignages du culte de El et de Baal à Ras Shamra-Ugarit et ailleurs en Syrie-Palestine', *Syria* 43: 1-19.

1972 (Observations on paper by Herdner [1972]), *CRAIBL* 1972: 697-99.

Schloen, J.D.

1993 'The Exile of Disinherited Kin in KTU 1.12 and KTU 1.23', *JNES* 52: 209-20.

Schmidt, B.B.

1994 *Israel's Beneficent Dead* (FAT, 11; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr).

1995 'Moon', in *DDD*: cols. 1098-113.

1996 'A Re-Evaluation of the Ugaritic King-List (KTU 1.113)', in Wyatt, Watson and Lloyd 1996: 289-304.

Schwemer, D.

1995 'Das alttestamentlicher Doppelritual *'lwt wšlmym* im Horizont der hurritschen Opfertermini *ambašši* und *kaldi*', in D.I. Owen and G. Wilhelm (eds.), *Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians, Edith Porada Memorial Volume* (Bethesda, MD: CDL Press): 81-116.

Segert, S.

1986 'An Ugaritic Text Related to the Fertility Cult (*KTU* 1.23)', in Bonanno 1986: 217-24.

Seitter, W.C., and H.W. Duèrbeck

1990 'Astronomischen Überlegungen zu dem ungaritischen Text über Sonne und Mars—KTU 1.78', in Dietrich and Loretz 1990: 281-86.

Selms, A. van

1954 *Marriage and Family Life in Ugaritic Literature* (POS, 1; London: Luzac).

1970 'Yammu's Dethronement by Baal. An Attempt to Reconstruct Texts UT 129, 137 and 68', *UF* 2: 251-68.
1971 'CTA 32: A Prophetic Liturgy', *UF* 3: 235-48.
1975a 'A Guest-Room for Ilu and its Furniture. An Interpretation of CTA 4, I, Lines 30-44 (Gordon, 51,I,30-44)', *UF* 7: 469-76.
1975b 'A Systematic Approach to CTA 5,I,1-8', *UF* 7: 477-82.
1979 'The Root *k-ṯ-r* and its Derivatives in Ugaritic Literature', *UF* 11: 739-44.

Seters, J. van
1975 *Abraham in History and Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Singer, I.
1999 'The History of Ugarit', in Watson and Wyatt 1999: 603-733.

Smith, G.A.
1931 *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 25th edn [1st edn 1894]).

Smith, J.Z.
1981 'The Bare Facts of Ritual', *HR* 20: 112-27.

Smith, M.S.
1986a 'Interpreting the Baal Cycle', *UF* 18: 313-39.
1986b 'Mt. *Il* in KTU 1.2 I 19-20', *UF* 18: 458.
1987 'Death in Jeremiah IX 20', *UF* 19: 289-93.
1992 'Rephaim', in *ABD*, I: 674-76.
1994 *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle*. I. *Introduction with Text, Translation and Commentary of KTU 1.1-1.2* (VTSup, 55; Leiden: E.J. Brill).
2001 *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Soldt, W.H. van
1988 'The Title *ṯ'y*', *UF* 20: 313-21.
1989 ' *'Aṯn, prln*, " 'Attā/ēnu the Diviner"', *UF* 21: 365-68.

Spalinger, A.J.
1978 'A Canaanite Ritual Found in Egyptian Reliefs', *JSSEA* 8: 47-60.

Sperling, S.D.
1993 '*HBR* and Friends', in M.E. Cohen, D.C. Snell and D.B. Weisberg (eds.), *The Tablet and the Scroll: Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William H. Hallo* (Bethesda, MD: CDL Press).

Spronk, K.
1986 *Beatific Afterlife in Ancient Israel and the Ancient Near East* (AOAT, 219; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker).
1988 'The Legend of Kirtu (KTU 1.14-16): A Study of the Structure and its Consequences for Interpretation', in W. van der Meer and J.C. de Moor (eds.), *The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry* (JSOTSup, 74; Sheffield: JSOT Press): 62-82.
1995 'Rahab', in *DDD*: cols. 1292-95.

Swiggers, P.
1984 'On the Nature of West-Semitic Writing Systems', *AuOr* 2: 149-51.

Sznycer, M.
1967 'Sur un passage du poème ougaritique de Ba'al et Yam (III AB)', *Semitica* 17: 23-27.

Tallqvist, K.L.
1938 *Akkadische Götterepitheta, mit einem Göttererzeichnis und einer Liste der prädikativen Elemente der sumerischen Götternamen* (Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica).
de Tarragon, J.-M.
1980 *Le culte à Ugarit* (CRB, 19; Paris: J. Gabalda).
1989 'Les rituels', in Caquot, de Tarragon and Cunchillos 1989: 125-238.
1995 'Temples et pratiques rituelles', in M. Yon, M. Sznycer and P. Bordreuil (eds.), *Le pays d'Ougarit autour de 1200 av. J.-C.* (RSO, 11, Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations): 203-10.
1998 'Le rituel ugaritique KTU 1.40: quelques réflexions', in Dietrich and Kottsieper 1998: 727-32.
Taylor, J.G.
1984 'Observations on the Root QBA "Call", in Ugaritic', *NUS* 32: 13.
1985 'A Long-Awaited Vocative Singular Noun with Final Aleph in Ugaritic (KTU 1.161.13)?', *UF* 17: 315-18.
1988 'A First and Last Thing to Do in Mourning: *KTU* 1.161 and Some Parallels', in Eslinger and Taylor 1988: 151-77.
Thompson, R.C.
1949 *A Dictionary of Assyrian Botany* (London: The British Academy).
Thomsen, M.-L.
1992 'The Evil Eye in Mesopotamia', *JNES* 51: 19-32.
Toorn, K., van der
1993 'Ilib and "the God of the Father"', *UF* 25: 379-87.
1995 'Hebat', in *DDD*: cols. 744-46.
1996 *Family Life and Religion in Babylonia, Syria and Israel: Continuity and Change in the Forms of Religious Life* (SHCANE, 7; Leiden: E.J. Brill).
Tromp, N.J.
1969 *Primitive Conceptions of Death and the Nether World in the Old Testament* (BibOr, 21; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute).
Tropper, J.
1985 'Akkadisch *nuḫḫutu* und die Repräsentation des Phonems /ḫ/ im Akkadischen', *ZA* 85: 58-66.
1989 *Nekromantie, Totenbefragung im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament* (AOAT, 223; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker).
1990 *Der ugaritsche Kausativstamm und die Kausativbildungen des Semitischen* (ALASP, 2; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag).
1992 'Sam'alisch *mt* "wahrlich" und Phänomen der Aphärese im Semitischen', *Or* 61: 448-53.
1993a *Die Inschriften von Zinjirli* (ALASP, 6; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag).
1993b 'Morphologische Besonderheiten des Spätugaritischen', *UF* 25: 389-94.
1994 'Ugaritisch *palt* und hebräisch *po'rot*', *UF* 26: 483-86 (pages bound in disorder!).
1996a 'Ugaritic Dreams: Notes on Ugaritic *ḏ(ḥ)rt* and *hdrt*', in Wyatt, Watson and Lloyd 1996: 305-13.
1996b 'Die sieben Frauen des Königs Keret', *UF* 27: 529-32.
2000 *Ugaritische Grammatik* (AOAT 273; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag).

Tropper, J., and E. Verreet
1988 'Ugaritisch *ndy*, *ydy*, *hdy*, *ndd* und *d(w)d*', *UF* 20: 339-50.
Troy, L.
1994 'Painting the Eye of Horus', in C. Berger, G. Clerc and N. Grimal (eds.), *Etudes pharaoniques* (BdE, 106/1: Cairo: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale): 351-60.
Trujillo, J.I.
1973 'The Ugaritic Ritual for a Sacrificial Meal Honouring the Good Gods' (dissertation, Johns Hopkins University).
Tsevat, M.
1953 'The Ugaritic Goddess Nikkal-wIb', *JNES* 12: 61-62.
1954 'The Canaanite god Šälaḥ', *VT* 4: 41-49, 322.
1958 'Marriage and Monarchical Legitimacy in Ugarit and Israel', *JSS* 3: 237-43.
1971 'Traces of Hittite at the Beginning of the Ugaritic Epic of Aqht', *UF* 3: 351-52.
1974a 'Comments on the Ugaritic Text UT 52', *EI* 14: 24*-27*.
1974b 'Sun Mountains at Ugarit', *JNSL* 3: 71-75.
1979 'Der Schlangentext von Ugarit UT 607', *UF* 11: 759-78.
Tsumura, D.
1974 'A Ugaritic God Mt-w-Šr, and his Two Weapons (UT 52: 8-11)', *UF* 6: 407-13.
1978 'A Problem of Myth and Ritual Relationship—CTA 23 (UT 52): 56-57 reconsidered', *UF* 10: 387-95.
1984 'The Problem of Childlessness in the Royal Epic of Ugarit', *BMECCJ* 1: 11-20.
Tuell, S.S.
1993 'A Riddle Resolved by an Enigma: Hebrew glš and Ugaritic glṯ', *JBL* 112: 99-104.
Udd, S.V.
1983 'More on the Vocalization of *LTN*', *VT* 33: 509-10.
Vattioni, F.
1996 'Gli ordinali nel fenicio-punico', *SEL* 13: 75-77.
Vawter, B.
1952 'The Ugaritic Use of *ǵlmt*', *CBQ* 14: 319-22.
te Velde, H.
1977 *Seth, God of Confusion* (Probleme der Ägyptologie, 6; Leiden: E.J. Brill).
Verreet, E.
1983 'Das silbenschliessende Aleph im Ugaritischen', *UF* 15: 223-58.
1984 'Beobachtungen zum ugaritischen Verbalsystem', *UF* 16: 307-21.
Vervenne, M.
1987 'Hebrew *šālîš*—Ugaritic *tlṯ*', *UF* 19: 355-73.
Virolleaud, C.
1929 'Les inscriptions cunéiformes de Ras Shamra', *Syria* 10: 304-10.
1931 'La lutte de Môt, fils des dieux et d'Aleïn, fils de Baal', *Syria* 12: 193-244.
1932 'Un nouveau chant du poème d'Alein-Baal', *Syria* 13: 113-63.

1933 'La naissance des dieux gracieux et beaux. Poème phénicien de Ras-Shamra', *Syria* 14: 128-51.
1934a 'Fragment nouveau du poème de Môt et Aleyn Baal', *Syria* 15: 226-43.
1934b 'La mort de Baal', *Syria* 15: 305-56.
1934c 'Proclamation de Seleg, chef de cinq peuples, d'après une tablette de Ras-Shamra', *Syria* 15: 147-54.
1935a 'La révolte de Košer contre Ba'al. Poème de Ras Shamra (III AB, A)', *Syria* 16: 29-45.
1935b 'Les chasses de Baal: poème de Ras Shamra', *Syria* 16: 247-66.
1935c 'Sur quatre fragments alphabétiques trouvés à Ras Shamra en 1934', *Syria* 16: 181-87.
1936a 'Baal et la génisse, poème de Ras-Shamra (IV AB)', *Syria* 17: 150-73.
1936b 'Hymne phénicien au dieu Nikal et aux déesses Košarôt provenant de Ras-Shamra', *Syria* 17: 209-28.
1936c 'La déesse 'Anat. Poème de Ras-Shamra (V AB) i', *Syria* 17: 335-45.
1936d *La légende phénicienne de Danel* (BAH, 21: MRS, 1: Paris: Geuthner).
1936e *La légende de Keret, roi des Sidoniens* (BAH, 22; MRS, 2; Paris: Geuthner).
1937 'La déesse 'Anat. Poème de Ras-Shamra (V AB) ii (V AB B), iii (V AB C)', *Syria* 18: 85-102, 256-70.
1938 *La déesse 'Anat* (BAH, 28, MRS, 4, Paris: Geuthner).
1939 'Note sur RŠ 4474', *Syria* 20: 129-33.
1941a 'Les Rephaïm. Fragments de poèmes de Ras Shamra', *Syria* 22: 1-30.
1941b 'Le roi Keret et son fils (II *K*). Poème de Ras Shamra', *Syria* 22: 105-36, 197-217, 23 (1942–43a): 1-20.
1942–43 'Le mariage du roi Keret (III *K*). Poème de Ras Shamra', *Syria* 23: 137-72.
1944–45a 'Le dieu 'Aštar (III AB, C). Fragment détaché du poème du Prince de la Mer', *Syria* 24: 1-12.
1944–45b 'Fragments mythologiques de Ras Shamra, III', *Syria* 24: 14-17.
1949 *Légendes de Babylone et de Canaan* (Paris: Maisonneuve).
1950 'Les nouvelles tablettes de Ras Shamra (1948-1949)', *Syria* 28: 22-56.
1957 *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit II: textes en cunéiformes alphabétiques des archives est, ouest centrales* (MRS, 7: Paris: Imprimerie Nationale).
1960 'Un nouvel épisode du mythe ugaritique de Baal', *CRAIBL* 1960: 180-86.
1965 *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit V: textes en cunéiformes alphabétiques des archives sud, sud-ouest et du petit palais* (MRS 11: Paris: Imprimerie Nationale).
1968 'Les nouveaux textes mythologiques et liturgiques de Ras Shamra (xxiv^{e} campagne, 1961)', *Ugaritica* 5: 545-606.

Vita, J.-P.
1995 *El ejército de Ugarit* (Banco de Datos Filogógicos Semíticos Noroccidentales Monografías, 1, Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas).
1996 'La herramienta *katinnu* en el texto de Ugarit RS 19.23', *Sefarad* 56: 439-43.

Walker, C.B.F.
1989 'Eclipse seen at Ugarit', *Nature* 338: 204-205.

Walls, N.H.
1992 *The Goddess Anat in Ugaritic Myth* (SBLDS, 135; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
Watson, W.G.E.
1976a 'Ugarit and the OT: Further Parallels', *Or* 45: 434-42.
1976b 'A Suppliant Surprised (CTA 16: I 41b-53a)', *JANES* 8: 106-11.
1976c 'Puzzling Passages in the Tale of Aqhat', *UF* 8: 371-78.
1977a 'Ugaritic and Mesopotamian Literary Texts', *UF* 9: 273-84.
1977b 'The Falcon Episode in the Aqhat Tale', *JNSL* 5: 71-72.
1979a 'An Unrecognized Hyperbole in *Krt*', *Or* 48: 112-17.
1979b 'The PN *ysb* in the Keret Legend', *UF* 11: 807-809.
1980 'Philological Notes', *NUS* 21: 8-9.
1983 'The Character of Ugaritic Poetry', *JNSL* 11: 157-69.
1986 'Unravelling Ugaritic *mdl*', *SEL* 3: 73-78.
1987 'Sul termine ugaritico *itl*', *SEL* 4: 57-65.
1988 'Notes on Some Ugaritic Words', *SEL* 6: 47-52.
1989 'What Does Ugaritic *gmn* Mean?', *AuOr* 7: 129-31.
1990 'Comments on KTU 1.114: 29'-31'', *AuOr* 8: 265-67.
1991 'Two Similes in *Aqht*', *UF* 23: 359-60.
1992a 'Final *-m* in Ugaritic', *AuOr* 10: 223-52.
1992b 'An Enigmatic Expression in Ugaritic', *AbrN* 30: 172-75.
1992c 'Imagery in a Ugaritic Incantation', *UF* 24: 367-68.
1993 '*Aṯrt ym*: Yet Another Proposal', *UF* 25: 431-34.
1994a 'The Ugaritic PN *krt*', *UF* 26: 497-500.
1994b 'Aspects of Style in KTU 1.23', *SEL* 11: 3-8.
1994c 'Comments on Ugaritic *wn*', *AuOr* 12: 229-232.
1994d *Traditional Techniques in Classical Hebrew Verse* (JSOTSup, 170; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
1995a 'Ugaritic Lexical Studies in Perspective', *SEL* 12: 217-28.
1995b 'Non-Semitic Words in the Ugaritic Lexicon', *UF* 27: 533-58.
1996a 'Comments on Some Ugaritic Lexical Items', *JNSL* 22: 73-84.
1996b 'Verse Patterns in KTU 1.119: 26-36', *SEL* 13: 25-30.
1998 'Parallel Word Pairs in the Song of Songs', in M. Dietrich and I. Kottsieper (eds.), *'Und Mose schrieb dieses Lied auf...'* (Festschrift O. Loretz; AOAT, 250; Kevelaer; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; Verlag Butzon & Bercker): 785-808.
2001 'El's Erudition', *AuOr* 19: 138–42.
Watson, W.G.E., and N. Wyatt
1997 'De nouveau sur les armes cérémonielles', *NABU* 1997/1: 27-28.
Watson, W.G.E., and N. Wyatt (eds.)
1999 *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies* (HdO I.39; Leiden: Brill).
Watts, J.W.
1989 '*Ḫnt*: An Ugaritic Formula of Intercession', *UF* 21: 443-49.
Weippert, M.
1969 'Ein ugaritischer Beleg für das Land "Qadi" der ägyptischen Texte?', *ZDPV* 85: 35-50.
West, D.R.
1995 *Some Cults of Greek Goddesses and Female Daemons of Oriental Origin*

(AOAT, 233; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker).

Westhuizen, J.P., van der
1985 'A Proposed Possible Solution to KTU 1.14 II 7 Based on Babylonian and Biblical Evidence', *UF* 17: 357-70.

Whitaker, R.E.
1969 'A Formular Analysis of Ugaritic Poetry' (dissertation, Harvard University).
1972 *A Concordance of the Ugaritic Literature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Whitelam, K.W.
1996 *The Invention of Ancient Israel: The Silencing of Palestinian History* (London: Routledge).

Whittle, A.
1996 *Europe in the Neolithic: The Creation of New Worlds* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Whybray, R.N.
1987 *The Making of the Pentateuch* (JSOTSup, 53; Sheffield: JSOT Press).

Wiggermann, F.A.M.
1989 'Tišpak, his Seal, and the Dragon *mušḫuššu*', in O. Haex and H.H. Curvers and P.M.M.G. Akkermans (eds.), *To the Euphrates and Beyond: Archaeological Studies in Honour of Maurits N. van Loon* (Rotterdam: Balkema).

Wiggins, S.A.
1993 *A Reassessment of 'Asherah': A Study of the Textual Sources of the First Two Millen[n]ia BCE* (AOAT, 235; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker).
1996 'Shapsh, Lamp of the Gods', in Wyatt, Watson and Lloyd 1996: 327-50.

Wilhelm, G.
1989 *The Hurrians* (Warminster: Aris and Phillips).

Wilson, J.A.
1969 'Egyptian Myths, Tales, and Mortuary Texts', in *ANET*: 3-36.

Wright, D.P.
2001 *Ritual in Narrative. The Dynamics of Feasting, Mourning and Retaliation Rites in the Ugaritic Tale of Aqhat* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).

Wright, R.M.
1994 'Egyptian *npʒp*: A Cognate for Ugaritic *mpr* "Convulsion"', *UF* 26: 539-41.

Wyatt, N.
1976 'Atonement Theology in Ugarit and Israel', *UF* 8: 415-30.
1977a 'The Identity of *Mt-w-Šr*', *UF* 9: 379-81.
1977b 'Some Problems in the Nikkal Poem (CTA 24)', *UF* 9: 285-90.
1980 'The Relationship of the Deities Dagan and Hadad', *UF* 12: 375-79.
1983a 'A Suggested Historical Context for the Keret Story', *UF* 15: 316-18.
1983b 'The Stela of the Seated God from Ugarit', *UF* 15: 271-77.
1985a '"Jedidiah" and Cognate Forms as a Title of Royal Legitimation', *Biblica* 66: 112-25.
1985b '"Araunah the Jebusite" and the Throne of David', *ST* 39: 39-53.

1985c 'Cosmic Entropy in Ugaritic Religious Thought', *UF* 17: 383-386.
1986a 'The Hollow Crown: Ambivalent Elements in West Semitic Royal Ideology', *UF* 18: 421-36.
1986b 'The AB Cycle and Kingship in Ugaritic Thought', *Cosmos* 2: 136-42.
1987a 'Sea and Desert: Symbolic Geography in West Semitic Religious Thought', *UF* 19: 375-89.
1987b 'Baal's Boars', *UF* 19: 391-98.
1987c 'Who Killed the Dragon?', *AuOr* 5: 185-98.
1988a 'The Source of the Ugaritic Myth of the Conflict of Ba'al and Yam', *UF* 20: 375-85.
1988b 'When Adam Delved: The Meaning of Genesis III 23', *VT* 38: 117-122.
1989a 'Near Eastern Echoes of Aryan Tradition', *SMSR* 55 (NS 13): 5-29.
1989b 'Quaternities in the Mythology of Baal', *UF* 21: 451-59.
1990a 'The Story of Dinah and Shechem', *UF* 22: 433-58.
1990b 'A Further Weapon for Baal?', *UF* 22: 459-66.
1990c '"Supposing him to be the gardener" (John 20, 15): A Study of the Paradise Motif in John', *ZNW* 25: 21-38.
1992a 'The Titles of the Ugaritic Storm-God', *UF* 24: 403-24.
1992b 'The Pruning of the Vine in KTU 1.23', *UF* 24: 426-30.
1992c 'A New Look at Ugaritic *šdmt*', *JSS* 37: 149-53.
1994 'The Theogony Motif in Ugarit and the Bible', in G.J. Brooke, A.H.W. Curtis and J.F. Healey (eds.), *Ugarit and the Bible* (UBL, 11; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag): 395-419.
1995a 'The Significance of *ṣpn* in West Semitic Thought: A Contribution to the History of a Mythological Motif', in Dietrich and Loretz 1995: 213-37.
1995b 'The Liturgical Context of Psalm 19 and its Mythical and Ritual Origins', *UF* 27: 559-96.
1995c 'Asherah', in *DDD*: cols. 183-95.
1995d 'Astarte', in *DDD*: cols. 203-13.
1995e 'Kinnaru', in *DDD*: cols. 911-13.
1996a 'The Vocabulary and Neurology of Orientation: The Ugaritic and Hebrew Evidence', in Wyatt, Watson and Lloyd 1996: 351-80.
1996b *Myths of Power: A Study of Royal Myth and Ideology in Ugaritic and Biblical Tradition* (UBL, 13; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag).
1996c 'Le centre du monde dans les littératures d'Ougarit et d'Israël', *JNSL* 21: 123-42.
1997 'Ilimilku's Ideological Programme: Ugaritic Royal Propaganda, and a Biblical Postscript', *UF* 29: 775-96.
1998a 'Arms and the King: The Earliest Allusions to the *Chaoskampf* Motif and their Implications for the Interpretation of the Ugaritic and Biblical Traditions', in M. Dietrich and I. Kottsieper (eds.), *'Und Mose schrieb dieses Lied auf...'* (Festschrift O. Loretz; AOAT, 250; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker): 833-82.
1998b 'Understanding Polytheism: Structure and Dynamic in a West Semitic Pantheon', *JHC* 5: 24-63.
1999a 'The Aqhat Story', in Watson and Wyatt 1999: 234-58.
1999b 'Religion at Ugarit: An Overview', in Watson and Wyatt 1999: 529-85.

1999c 'Degrees of Divinity: Mythical and Ritual Aspects of West Semitic Kingship', *UF* 31: 853-87.

2000 'Just how "Divine" were the Kings of Ugarit?', in J. Sanmartín, M. Molina and I.M. Rowe (eds.), *Arbor Scientiae. Estudios del próximo Oriente Antiguo dedicados a Gregorio del Olmo Lete con ocasión de su 65 aniversario* (*AuOR* 17-18; Madrid: CSIC): 133-41.

2001a *Space and Time in the Religious Life of the Ancient Near East* (Bib Sem, 85; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

2001b 'Ilimilku the Theologian: the Ideological Roles of Athtar and Baal in KTU 1.1 and 1.6', in O. Loretz, K. Metzler and H. Schaudig (eds.), *Ex Oriente Lux: Festschrift für Manfried Dietrich zu seinem 65. Geburtstag am 6.11.2000...* (AOAT 281, Münster: Ugarit-Verlag): 597-610.

Wyatt N., W.G.E. Watson and J.B. Lloyd (eds.)

1996 *Ugarit, Religion and Culture: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Ugarit, Religion and Culture: Edinburgh, July 1994* (Festschrift J.C.L. Gibson; UBL, 12; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag).

Xella, P.

1972 'Per una riconsiderazione della morfologia del dio Ḥoron', *AION* 32: 271-86.

1973 *Il mito di ŠḤR e ŠLM. Saggio sulla mitologia ugaritica* (SS, 44, Rome: Centro di Studi Semitici).

1976 *Problemi del mito nel Vicino Oriente Antico* (AIONS, 7; Naples).

1977 'Studi sulla religione della Siria antica. I El e il vino (RS 24.258)', *SSR* 1: 229-61.

1978a 'L'épisode de Dnil et Kothar (*KTU* 1.17 = *CTA* 17 v 1-31) et Gen. xviii 1-16', *VT* 28: 483-88.

1978b 'Un testo ugaritico recente (RS 24.266, Verso, 9-19) e il "sacrificio dei primi nati"', *RSF* 6: 127-36.

1981 *I Testi Rituali di Ugarit* (SS, 54; Rome: Istituto di Studi del Vicino Oriente).

1982 *Gli antenati di Dio* (Verona: Essedue).

1983a 'Eblaitica *mu-ḫu* SAG ed ugaritico *mḫ riš*', *SEL* 1: 23-33.

1983b 'Problemi di lessografia ugaritica', in *24 Atti del Sodalizio Glottologico Milanese* (Milan): 74-78.

1984 '"Tu sei mio fratello ed io sono tua sorella!" (KTU 1.18 i 24)', *AuOr* 2: 151-53.

1995a 'Reshep', in *DDD*: cols. 1324-30.

1995b 'Haby', in *DDD*: cols. 715-16.

1996 'Les pouvoirs du dieu 'Attar', in Wyatt, Watson and Lloyd 1996: 381-404.

Yadin, Y.

1947 (as Y. Sukenik) 'The Composite Bow of the Canaanite Goddess Anath', *BASOR* 107: 11-15.

1963 *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson).

Yon, M.

1987b 'Les rhytons du sanctuaire', in Yon 1987: 343-50.

1996 'The Temple of the Rhytons at Ugarit', in Wyatt, Watson and Lloyd 1996: 405-22.

Yon, M. (ed.)
1987a *Le centre de la ville. 38e–44e campagnes (1978-1984)* (RSO, 3; Paris: ERC).
1991 *Arts et industries de la pierre* (RSO, 4; Paris: ERC).
Young, D.W.
1977 'With Snakes and Dates: A Sacred Marriage Drama at Ugarit', *UF* 9: 291-314.
1979 'The Ugaritic Myth of the god Ḥoron', *UF* 11: 839-48.
Young, G.D. (ed.)
1981 *Ugarit in Retrospect: Fifty Years of Ugarit and Ugaritic* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns).
Younger, K.L.
1997 'Ugaritic King List', in Hallo 1997: 356-57.
Van Zijl, P.J.
1975 'A Discussion of the Words *'anš* and *nšy* in the Ugaritic Texts', *UF* 7: 503-13.

INDEXES

INDEX OF REFERENCES

BIBLE

Old Testament
Genesis
1.5 131
1.7 371
1.10-14 52
1.21 92
2–3 385
2.7 118, 257, 449
2.10-14 379
3.3-5 276
3.19 257
3.21 448
4.4 196, 270
7.11-12 105
8.2 105
14 383
14.17 240
15.1 226
15.2 219
18.1-15 269
27 372
30.37-38 449
34 337, 345, 387
34.12 338
37.23 127
41.14 127
49.14 205
49.17 378

Exodus
1.15 211, 341
3.14 83
4.2 445
7.10 445
13.9 88
13.12-14 270
14.16 239
15.1-8 133
15.6 239
15.8 166, 288
16.13-14 297
17.8-16 239
17.16 44
21.2 185
22.28-30 270
23.19 327
23.23 344
29.3 343
32.1 45, 367
32.11 239
32.20 135
34.29-30 263
34.39-35 166

Leviticus
6.3 337
7.11 431
7.30 419
8.29 419
15 209
15.2-3 337
19.27-28 127
19.28 308
22.21 213
23.21 349
25.40 185
25.45-46 185

Numbers
11.9 297
16.31-32 436
20.8-11 133
21.8-9 386

Deuteronomy
4.34 239
6.8 88
11.18 88
14.1 127, 308
15.12 185
20.7 192
21.1-9 293, 308
27.14 400
28.1-6 232
33.29 226

Judges
6.36-40 297
9.13 97
11.37-40 224

Ruth
1.4 131

I Samuel
2.10 389
13.5 189
16.14-23 223
17.39 132
18.25-27 73
21.9 254
28 433
28.13 257, 317, 399

2 Samuel
1.21 121, 296
7.1-17 182
7.6 213
9.7-13 436
15.18 179
17.11 189

1 Kings
1.31 200
2.7 436
5.3 406
6.38 235
7.23-26 168, 353
8.65 235
13.11-26 200
18.28 308
22.20-25 276

2 Kings
3.27 422
7.2 105
7.19 105
16.3 422
17.17 422
21.6 422
23.10 422
23.11 378
23.13 200
25.29 127

1 Chronicles
28.5 44
29.23 44, 49

2 Chronicles
4.2-5 353

Job
1.2 213
1.21 257
2.8 127
3.3 264
7.5 127
10.9 257
19.17 368
28.26 190
33.6 236
34.14 118, 257
34.15 257
38.25 190
42.13 213

Psalms
3.4 226
6 212
6.6 257
7.11 226
8.4 255
10.9 445
11.4 197
19.7 198
19.8-10 340
29 296, 445
42.2 118
42.4 436
42.8 52
42.8 MT 353
47.10 226
57.5 368
58.6 379
68.5 368, 396
72.8 88
74.13-14 115
80.6 436
86.16 185
89.25 389
89.26 88
102.5 115
105.2 396
106.9 68
110 44
110.1 49, 103, 436
110.3 206
110.7 133
116.16 185
119 400
121.5-6 432
136.13 329
139.8 257

Proverbs
6.13 389
9.3 109
12.15 351
23.31 139
25.23 274
26.23 275
27.8 80

Ecclesiastes
1.2 437

Song of Songs
4.1 389
6.5 389
7.3 159

Isaiah
1.17 239
1.23 239
5.28 266
6 235
6.1-4 109
7.14 58, 214, 337, 352
8.19 447
9.5 264
11.2 340
14 184, 337
14.9-21 431
14.9-20 257
14.9-15 133
14.13 171
14.14 160
19.5 68
21.15 266
23.16 161
24.18 105
25.4 432
27.1 115
40 235
42.14 211
55.1-3 205
55.1 100
55.11 60
66.1 436

Jeremiah
1.9-12 60
7.31 422
8.23 222
9.20 104

Jeremiah (cont.)
16.6 308
20.15 264
25.38 445
30.16 170

Ezekiel
1.4-24 284
8.16-17 226
10.8-17 284
16.24 357
16.26 337
16.31 357
16.39 357
17.7 284
21.26 93
23.20 337
28 184
28.2-10 133
28.12-19 133
28.13-14 160

Hosea
4.18 226

Joel
2.3-11 73
2.3-9 192

Amos
1.3 85
1.6 85
1.9 85

Micah
6.7 422

Zechariah
9.9 297
10.1 190

Malachi
1.11 238
3.10 105

Tobit
6.14-15 180

Ecclesiasticus
40.1 257

New Testament
Matthew
1.2-16 211
1.17 211
21.1-7 297

Mark
7.28 407

Luke
2.10-11 264
14.23 207

John
9.2 445

James
1.17 46

Revelation
1.8 60
12.3 115

UGARITIC

KTU
1–3 21
1.1–1.6 21, 135, 140, 220, 436
1.1–1.2 83
1.1 89
1.1 ii 7 51
1.1 ii 9 54
1.1 ii 10 433
1.1 ii 11-12 53
1.1 ii 11 326
1.1 ii 14-15 53
1.1 ii 14 54
1.1 ii 16 43, 202
1.1 ii 17-23 39, 90
1.1 ii 17-22 44
1.1 ii 17 43
1.1 ii 18 182
1.1 ii 21 187
1.1 ii 24 45
1.1 iii 269
1.1 iii 1 50, 54, 89
1.1 iii 2 40, 53
1.1 iii 4 40
1.1 iii 5 90, 269
1.1 iii 10-16 39
1.1 iii 10 42
1.1 iii 12-16 231
1.1 iii 12 40, 42, 45, 253, 438
1.1 iii 14 433
1.1 iii 15 59
1.1 iii 16 134, 279
1.1 iii 18-20 88
1.1 iii 20-21 88, 89
1.1 iii 22-23 99
1.1 iii 22 54
1.1 iii 24 52, 410
1.1 iii 36 88
1.1 iv 39
1.1 iv 5 434
1.1 iv 9-10 260
1.1 iv 13-32 132
1.1 iv 14 224
1.1 iv 24-25 80, 140
1.1 iv 24 92, 133, 320
1.1 iv 28 405
1.1 iv 30-32 322
1.1 v 49
1.1 v 28 315
1.2 23, 37
1.2 i 37, 51
1.2 i 4 50
1.2 i 6-7 67
1.2 i 7-9 241
1.2 i 7 384
1.2 i 13-35 418

1.2 i 13 55, 154, 184, 201, 300, 337, 352, 373, 399, 417
1.2 i 14-15 104
1.2 i 18-19 128
1.2 i 19 87
1.2 i 20 275
1.2 i 26 258
1.2 i 30-47 96
1.2 i 34-35 128
1.2 i 38 86, 283
1.2 i 40 68
1.2 i 42 88
1.2 i 43 86
1.2 ii 20 221
1.2 ii 60 52
1.2 iii 9, 37, 51, 63
1.2 iii 4-5 99
1.2 iii 4 207, 352
1.2 iii 7 168
1.2 iii 10-11 40, 183
1.2 iii 16 154
1.2 iii 17 50
1.2 iii 19 40, 195
1.2 iii 20 252
1.2 iii 23 58
1.2 iv 51
1.2 iv 6-7 51
1.2 iv 11-23 56
1.2 iv 11 364
1.2 iv 12-13 50
1.2 iv 14 56, 140
1.2 iv 16 140
1.2 iv 19-20 50
1.2 iv 25 88
1.2 iv 27 407
1.2 vi 11-12 266
1.2 vi 11 98
1.2 vi 15 284
1.3–6 83
1.3 76
1.3 i 339
1.3 i 6 397
1.3 i 9 71, 357
1.3 i 15 373
1.3 i 16 79, 216, 397
1.3 i 18-22 76, 273
1.3 i 18 220
1.3 i 23-25 122
1.3 i 23-24 339
1.3 i 23 339
1.3 ii 339
1.3 ii 2 424
1.3 ii 5 170
1.3 ii 7 170, 330
1.3 ii 10-11 192
1.3 ii 11-13 170
1.3 ii 12 170
1.3 ii 16 272
1.3 ii 17 353, 420
1.3 ii 18 168
1.3 ii 22 263
1.3 ii 25-26 295
1.3 ii 31 230, 390
1.3 ii 37 263, 276
1.3 iii 1 197
1.3 iii 4-8 390
1.3 iii 4 223, 290, 390
1.3 iii 5 390
1.3 iii 6 150
1.3 iii 8-32 418
1.3 iii 11-12 40
1.3 iii 13-31 39
1.3 iii 24 45
1.3 iii 29 42, 45
1.3 iii 31-33 390
1.3 iii 31 92, 103, 160
1.3 iii 32-35 303
1.3 iii 33-35 137
1.3 iii 40 369
1.3 iii 42 115
1.3 iii 43 117, 145
1.3 iii 45 291, 409
1.3 iv 1-3 50, 140
1.3 iv 2-3 50
1.3 iv 3 90
1.3 iv 7-20 39
1.3 iv 21-31 39
1.3 iv 35–44 100
1.3 iv 35 291
1.3 iv 46-48 152
1.3 iv 47-52 100
1.3 iv 52-53 90
1.3 iv 54 131
1.3 iv 62-v 27-29 152
1.3 v 3-4 152
1.3 v 4-8 277
1.3 v 10 131
1.3 v 13 372
1.3 v 17-18 113, 134
1.3 v 18 113
1.3 v 20-31 409
1.3 v 20-25 278
1.3 v 23-25 84
1.3 v 23 84, 239, 278
1.3 v 27-28 278
1.3 v 27 131, 283
1.3 v 28 278
1.3 v 30-34 100
1.3 v 35 59
1.3 v 38-39 152
1.3 v 38 152
1.3 v 40–41 83
1.3 vi 39
1.3 vi 1-25 103
1.3 vi 1 369
1.3 vi 4-16 46
1.3 vi 6 43
1.3 vi 10-25 418
1.3 vi 13-16 396
1.3 vi 15-16 43
1.3 vi 23 43
1.3 vi 3 67
1.4 i 1-22 103
1.4 i 9-11 152
1.4 i 13-14 43
1.4 i 23–43 65
1.4 i 23 103
1.4 i 25-28 275
1.4 i 30-41 272
1.4 i 32 187
1.4 i 33-34 50
1.4 i 34-35 50
1.4 i 34 263, 436
1.4 i 39 443
1.4 i 41 78
1.4 i 43 78, 103, 343
1.4 ii 5-11 100
1.4 ii 5-9 96
1.4 ii 16-20 137, 303

KTU (cont.)
1.4 ii 55 432
1.4 iii 14-16 93
1.4 iii 28-29 92
1.4 iii 33-36 92
1.4 iv 40
1.4 iv 2-15 103
1.4 iv 4-5 81, 297
1.4 iv 4 124, 345
1.4 iv 14-15 298
1.4 iv 22 379
1.4 iv 23-24 213
1.4 iv 28-30 295
1.4 iv 28-29 263
1.4 iv 28 412
1.4 iv 29 263, 436
1.4 iv 36-38 270
1.4 iv 45-46 87
1.4 iv 50-51 152
1.4 iv 58–v 1 88
1.4 v 7 389
1.4 v 25 295
1.4 v 36 65
1.4 v 39-40 134
1.4 v 41 92
1.4 v 42 346
1.4 v 55 53, 78
1.4 vi 10-13 96, 104
1.4 vi 22-35 235
1.4 vi 35 65
1.4 vi 39 113
1.4 vi 40-43 322
1.4 vi 41-43 87
1.4 vi 43 186
1.4 vi 45-46 87
1.4 vi 55 218, 270
1.4 vi 56 270
1.4 vi 58-59 270
1.4 vii 17-34 104
1.4 vii 19-20 104
1.4 vii 39 373
1.4 vii 45-52 114
1.4 vii 47 443
1.4 vii 54 58, 418
1.4 viii 21, 132
1.4 viii 3 321
1.4 viii 17 106, 134
1.4 viii 20-24 85
1.4 viii 21 225
1.4 viii 23-24 134
1.4 viii 45 78
1.4 viii 47 92, 103
1.4 viii 56-60 112
1.5 19, 162
1.5 i 121
1.5 i 1-8 114
1.5 i 3 79
1.5 i 4-8 85
1.5 i 4 161
1.5 i 5-8 113
1.5 i 5-6 282
1.5 i 11-22 426
1.5 i 11-17 113
1.5 i 14-16 426
1.5 i 14-15 145
1.5 i 15 79
1.5 i 16 426
1.5 i 17 426
1.5 i 18-20 48
1.5 i 20-22 426
1.5 i 21 426
1.5 i 31-35 113
1.5 ii 121
1.5 ii 2-3 334
1.5 ii 42-43 162
1.5 iii 12 223
1.5 iii 15 179
1.5 iv 5 121
1.5 iv 9 215
1.5 iv 19-22 271
1.5 iv 20 406
1.5 v–vi 120
1.5 v 8-9 362
1.5 v 9-11 122
1.5 v 17-25 113
1.5 v 22 196, 214
1.5 vi 3-9 231
1.5 vi 6-7 157, 159
1.5 vi 6 124, 160
1.5 vi 8-25 162
1.5 vi 11-14 438
1.5 vi 12-14 129
1.5 vi 13 263, 436
1.5 vi 14-16 128, 129
1.5 vi 17-22 308
1.5 vi 25 438
1.5 vi 28 160
1.6 15
1.6 i 2-5 308
1.6 i 10 436
1.6 i 17 138
1.6 i 28 345
1.6 i 39-42 94
1.6 i 44-67 53
1.6 i 46 141
1.6 i 48 165
1.6 i 55 165
1.6 i 60-61 50, 92
1.6 i 60 263, 436
1.6 i 65 140
1.6 ii 5 169, 207
1.6 ii 12-19 19
1.6 ii 12 279
1.6 ii 15-25 85
1.6 ii 16 63
1.6 ii 21 411
1.6 ii 22 106, 188
1.6 ii 24-25 113
1.6 ii 30-37 67
1.6 ii 31-35 19, 141, 235
1.6 ii 32-33 141
1.6 ii 34 135
1.6 ii 35-37 280
1.6 ii 37 256
1.6 iii 15 436
1.6 v 1-4 94
1.6 v 5-6 50
1.6 v 7-8 266
1.6 v 11-19 135
1.6 v 12-19 235
1.6 v 18-19 135
1.6 v 19-25 372
1.6 vi 21, 242
1.6 vi 10-11 94, 372
1.6 vi 22-35 129
1.6 vi 24 438
1.6 vi 33-35 140
1.6 vi 40 433
1.6 vi 42-53 129
1.6 vi 45-53 83, 85
1.6 vi 46-47 398
1.6 vi 46 291
1.6 vi 48-49 447
1.6 vi 48 317

1.6 vi 51 79
1.6 vi 54-58 21, 114, 242, 437
1.6 vi 57-58 400
1.6 vi 57 200, 401, 418, 419, 435, 444
1.7.22 76, 290
1.7.35 72
1.8 ii 3-4 152
1.8 ii 7 58, 111, 418
1.8 ii 8 112, 432
1.9 142
1.9 i 36 299
1.10 i 4 297, 309
1.10 ii 9 371
1.10 ii 30 161
1.10 iii 71
1.10 iii 7-10 173
1.10 iii 7-8 337, 390
1.10 iii 28 78
1.10 iii 29-30 40, 73
1.10 iii 31 126
1.10 iii 34 397, 398
1.10 iii 36-37 264
1.11 71
1.11.1 115
1.11.6 158
1.12 334
1.12 i 12-13 295
1.12 ii 42-45 235
1.12 ii 44-45 335
1.12 ii 46-49 142
1.13.7 73
1.13.9-10 73
1.13.9 40, 388
1.13.31 71
1.14–16 21, 49, 168
1.14 i 177, 200
1.14 i 1 189
1.14 i 3 220
1.14 i 15-20 85, 211
1.14 i 26-30 252
1.14 i 36 198
1.14 i 37 399, 448
1.14 i 40-41 399
1.14 i 40 58
1.14 i 41 399
1.14 ii 6 184
1.14 ii 9 186, 197, 310
1.14 ii 12 198, 213
1.14 ii 13-14 198
1.14 ii 19 41, 251, 351, 428
1.14 ii 2-3 190
1.14 ii 36 185
1.14 ii 37-38 199
1.14 ii 38 326
1.14 ii 46-47 154
1.14 ii 47 199
1.14 ii 50–iii 1 370
1.14 ii 51–111.1 138
1.14 iii 3 201, 317
1.14 iii 4-5 385
1.14 iii 5 234, 390
1.14 iii 9 125
1.14 iii 22 184
1.14 iii 26-27 203
1.14 iii 30 193
1.14 iii 32 184
1.14 iii 39 125, 268
1.14 iii 43-44 310
1.14 iii 44-45 204
1.14 iii 48 173, 204
1.14 iii 49 58
1.14 iii 51 183
1.14 iii 52 186, 310
1.14 iii 56 316
1.14 iv 9 188
1.14 iv 21 191
1.14 iv 26-28 192
1.14 iv 29-31 370
1.14 iv 35-36 179
1.14 iv 36-43 242
1.14 iv 37 146, 240, 419, 444
1.14 iv 41 58
1.14 iv 42-43 234
1.14 iv 45 235
1.14 iv 46 193
1.14 iv 47 193
1.14 v 38 185
1.14 vi 8 185
1.14 vi 9-10 203
1.14 vi 11 193
1.14 vi 13 184
1.14 vi 35-39 202
1.15 i 1-8 195
1.15 i 5-8 196
1.15 ii 14-15 255
1.15 ii 16-20 260
1.15 ii 16-17 216
1.15 ii 18 260
1.15 ii 22 418
1.15 ii 23-24 211
1.15 ii 24-25 213
1.15 ii 27 373
1.15 iii 214, 222
1.15 iii 4 251, 423, 433
1.15 iii 6 211
1.15 iii 7-12 209
1.15 iii 12 76, 209, 362
1.15 iii 15 440
1.15 iii 16 211, 241
1.15 iii 18-19 269
1.15 iii 24-25 209, 211
1.15 iv 3 125, 196, 263, 268, 373
1.15 iv 6-7 122
1.15 iv 6 71
1.15 iv 8-90 188
1.15 iv 21-25 217
1.15 iv 23 71, 397
1.15 v 5-8 216
1.15 v 18-19 224
1.15 vi 221
1.16 19
1.16 i 19, 214
1.16 i 6-23 230
1.16 i 8 40, 44
1.16 i 10 399
1.16 i 11 55
1.16 i 14-23 229
1.16 i 20 184
1.16 i 29 76, 211, 212, 280
1.16 i 36 48, 217
1.16 i 39-40 216, 238, 405

KTU (cont.)
1.16 i 39 76, 211
1.16 i 40 187
1.16 i 46 275
1.16 i 53-54 272
1.16 i 58 275
1.16 ii 21 275
1.16 ii 33 275
1.16 ii 41 219
1.16 ii 50-51 221
1.16 iii 19
1.16 iii 1 75, 390
1.16 v 49
1.16 v 8-9 201
1.16 v 10-50 238
1.16 v 20-21 253, 265
1.16 v 21 201
1.16 v 28-30 449
1.16 vi 18 225, 442
1.16 vi 21 225
1.16 vi 22 327, 418
1.16 vi 25-38 221
1.16 vi 31-38 225
1.16 vi 32 278
1.16 vi 33-34 267
1.16 vi 49 418
1.16 vi 54-58 56, 212
1.16 vi 55 384
1.16 vi 57-58 57
1.16 vi 57 57
1.16 vi 58 57
1.16 vi 59 221
1.17–1.19 21, 176, 317, 406
1.17 i 1-33 65
1.17 i 1-2 317
1.17 i 1 265, 267
1.17 i 2 260, 307
1.17 i 7-8 265
1.17 i 15 265
1.17 i 16-33 232
1.17 i 25-33 210
1.17 i 25-28 229
1.17 i 26-33 276
1.17 i 27 118, 136, 285, 433
1.17 i 30-31 410
1.17 i 30 118
1.17 i 31 351
1.17 i 33 310
1.17 i 34-36 208, 260
1.17 i 34 199, 307
1.17 i 38 309
1.17 i 39–ii 47 125
1.17 ii 9 238
1.17 ii 10-11 214
1.17 ii 11 307, 436
1.17 ii 14 262
1.17 ii 24-47 340
1.17 ii 26-42 55
1.17 ii 26-27 308
1.17 ii 26 308
1.17 ii 39 253
1.17 ii 43-44 333
1.17 v 2 289
1.17 v 6-7 294, 439
1.17 v 8 307
1.17 v 16 125, 214, 253
1.17 v 24-25 43
1.17 v 37-39 372
1.17 v 37 406
1.17 vi 21
1.17 vi 8 258
1.17 vi 15 227
1.17 vi 20-24 92, 267
1.17 vi 20 171
1.17 vi 23 371
1.17 vi 31 220
1.17 vi 32-33 76
1.17 vi 34 92
1.18 i 7-12 86
1.18 i 8-20 409
1.18 i 11-12 84
1.18 i 16 131, 283
1.18 i 24 277
1.18 i 25 337
1.18 i 26-27 223
1.18 i 30-31 308
1.18 ii 249
1.18 iv 292
1.18 iv 3 116
1.18 iv 7-8 281
1.18 iv 8 308
1.18 iv 9-11 311
1.18 iv 17-18 303
1.18 iv 17 66
1.18 iv 20-21 303
1.18 iv 21 58, 397
1.18 iv 23-26 257
1.18 iv 24-26 257
1.18 iv 24-25 39
1.18 iv 36-37 39
1.18 iv 43-44 39
1.18 vi 3-4 164
1.19 19, 136, 287, 290
1.19 i 282, 287
1.19 i 1-17 277
1.19 i 1-9 133
1.19 i 1 246
1.19 i 3 281
1.19 i 5 266
1.19 i 8 275, 437
1.19 i 10 80, 409
1.19 i 29 299
1.19 i 30-31 120
1.19 i 42-46 120
1.19 i 42-43 235
1.19 ii 1-3 295
1.19 ii 2-3 309, 333
1.19 ii 27 292
1.19 ii 28 58
1.19 ii 34 183
1.19 ii 35 361
1.19 ii 39 408
1.19 iii 2 285
1.19 iii 6 306
1.19 iii 20-21 306
1.19 iii 35 306
1.19 iii 46 267
1.19 iv 1-7 281
1.19 iv 8 306
1.19 iv 13-18 235
1.19 iv 21 312
1.19 iv 24-25 251
1.19 iv 24 250
1.19 iv 31 250
1.19 iv 39 261
1.19 iv 42 186
1.19 iv 44 259
1.19 iv 53 139
1.19 iv 55 139

1.19 iv 63 346
1.19 v 42 197
1.19 vi 62 308
1.20–22 210, 250, 312
1.20 317
1.20 i 1 405
1.20 i 2 291
1.20 ii 4 98
1.21 ii 4 291
1.22 23
1.22 i 8-9 319
1.22 i 8 112, 371
1.22 i 9 319
1.22 i 10 434
1.22 i 23-24 316
1.22 ii 12 321
1.23 46, 57, 83, 93, 96, 100, 129, 163, 206, 209, 266, 384, 413, 418
1.23.4 39
1.23.6 71, 270, 397
1.23.8-11 337
1.23.8-9 337, 443
1.23.10 62
1.23.12 418
1.23.13 207
1.23.19 354
1.23.23 173
1.23.30 73, 117
1.23.32-33 138
1.23.33 159
1.23.35 388
1.23.37 443
1.23.45 85
1.23.48 85
1.23.51 199, 261, 266, 341
1.23.52-53 264
1.23.53-54 140
1.23.54 106, 180, 224, 255, 297, 309, 407, 432
1.23.56-57 341
1.23.56 261
1.23.57 266
1.23.61-62 120
1.23.61 120, 173
1.23.65 106
1.23.66-68 235
1.23.66-67 166
1.23.72-76 100
1.24 55, 387, 413
1.24.5-6 264
1.24.6 371
1.24.7 58, 418
1.24.9 280, 374, 443
1.24.43 316
1.24.48-50 265
1.25 411
1.34 411
1.39.8 324
1.39.9 259, 351
1.39.12 144
1.39.17 144
1.39.19 418
1.40 411, 433
1.40.1 93
1.40.8 46
1.40.9 226
1.40.17 46
1.40.25 46
1.40.26 98, 130, 226, 420
1.40.27 92
1.40.34 46
1.40.41 363
1.40.42 46, 363
1.41 23
1.41.3 356, 417
1.41.12 46
1.41.15 46
1.41.17 324, 419
1.41.19 259
1.41.21 187, 428
1.41.25 58, 418
1.41.31 46
1.41.38 420
1.41.42 417
1.41.47 253, 417
1.41.50-51 328
1.41.51 357
1.41.53 235
1.43 411
1.43.1 350, 428
1.43.4 428
1.43.19 422
1.46.6 362
1.46.10 417
1.47 384, 410, 422, 427
1.47.2 256
1.47.5-12 417
1.47.5-11 142, 211, 340
1.47.14 301
1.47.17 72
1.47.23 77
1.47.24 420
1.47.26 427
1.47.32 212
1.47.33 421, 435
1.48.3 420
1.48.18 420
1.61 210
1.65.4 46
1.65.14 65
1.71.6 413
1.71.8 413
1.71.10 413
1.71.25 413
1.72.8 413
1.72.10 413
1.72.14 413
1.72.20 413
1.72.24 413
1.72.35 413
1.72.39 413
1.78 112, 297, 409
1.85.6 413
1.85.8 413
1.85.11 413
1.85.15 413
1.85.22 413
1.85.28 413
1.85.32 413
1.87 23
1.87.18 325

KTU (cont.)
1.87.20 351
1.87.27 418
1.87.29 420
1.87.39 420
1.87.51 417
1.92 68, 273, 406
1.92.2 328
1.92.31 426
1.96 372, 449
1.96.5 446
1.100 236, 413
1.100.1 117
1.100.5 442
1.100.15 338
1.100.20 40
1.100.34-35 199
1.100.52 140
1.100.58 424
1.100.63-64 193
1.100.64-65 424
1.100.64 390
1.101.1 170
1.101.2 330
1.101.3-4 109
1.101.3 160
1.101.8 193, 385
1.101.12 144
1.101.14 75, 230
1.101.16-17 77, 290
1.101.17-18 76
1.104.21 328
1.105.17-18 417
1.107 236, 384, 385, 413
1.107.2 423
1.107.41 382
1.107.43 140
1.108 125, 250
1.108.1 434
1.108.2 383
1.108.3 388, 443
1.108.7 170
1.108.8 286
1.108.10 71
1.109.5 357
1.113 35, 114, 146, 243,
1.113.6 146
1.113.11-17 430
1.113.12 345
1.113.19 345
1.113.20 146, 430, 435
1.113.23 146, 435
1.114 47, 71, 187
1.114.1 50, 225, 270, 315
1.114.2 47
1.114.3 270
1.114.4 268
1.114.5 67
1.114.11 68, 306
1.114.14 279
1.114.16-19 258
1.114.16 270
1.114.18-19 258
1.114.19 46, 134
1.114.23 328
1.114.27 68
1.118 410
1.118.1 256
1.118.6 72
1.118.22 77
1.118.23 420
1.118.32 435
1.118.33 324
1.119.4 354
1.119.5 348
1.119.7 58, 447
1.119.8 200, 444
1.119.9 327
1.119.11 444
1.119.14 359
1.119.16 345
1.119.32-33 357
1.123.8 410
1.123.11 140
1.123.19 418
1.124 210, 433, 440
1.124.2 391
1.124.6 384
1.124.8 72
317, 430, 434, 435
1.133.2-5 117
1.133.9-11 426
1.139.9 418
1.148.6 361
1.148.9 362
1.148.22 352
1.148.34 418
1.161 35, 114, 212, 243, 250, 257, 315, 400, 403, 421, 424, 431
1.161.2-12 256
1.161.2 419
1.161.3 210, 423
1.161.4 210
1.161.7 321, 395
1.161.10 210, 423
1.161.11 362
1.161.12-13 146, 401, 402
1.161.12 146
1.161.13 44, 146, 345
1.161.17 292
1.161.20 128
1.161.22-26 267
1.161.26 146
1.163 297
1.169 92, 276, 326, 337, 384
1.169.1 80, 163, 234, 385
1.169.2-3 257
1.169.2 419
1.169.8 256
1.169.10 417
1.171.2 423
1.171.3 381
1.174.2 423
2.10.11-13 181
2.14.8 440
2.14.12 440
2.14.17 440
2.15.9-10 368
2.16.2 440
2.32.10 284

2.34.2	440	4.247.18	408	6.13	143, 255
2.38.3	200	4.290.3	284	6.13.2	440
4.50.13	200	4.341.1-2	420	6.14	143, 255
4.81	101	4.366	101	7.53.4	440
4.93 iv 3	321	4.760.5	423	7.63	400
4.168.9-10	359	5	21	9.3 iii 15	418

OTHER ANCIENT REFERENCES

Qumran		2.[033]	255	20.24.32	435
1QH		2.[038]	58, 286, 397	20.24.33	324
4.8	80	4.427	42, 111,	20.235.13	364
5.9-10	117		251, 389	23.394	208, 251
		5.183	255	24.440	208
Christian Authors		6.[021]	255	25.455	416
Eusebius		6.[028]	255	26.142.6	362
Praep. Ev.		8.295	92, 208,	75.247	432
1.10	110		251, 432	78.41	251, 432
1.10.9	145	16.144	221, 402	81.3659	251, 432
		16.393A	208	88.70	92, 251
Classical Authors		16.401	284	90.1	92
Plutarch		19.23.1	364	1992.2016	9, 21
De Iside		19.23.5	364		
16	106	19.135.2	364	Inscriptions	
73	135	19.174	372, 373	*KAI*	
		20.24	9, 410	2.3	439
Akkadian		20.24.1	256	27.5-8	449
RS		20.24.16	72	215.16	91
1.[089]	255	20.24.22	77		
2.[014]	76	20.24.23	420		

INDEX OF AUTHORS

Aartun, K. 137, 146, 322, 323
Aboud, J. 246, 435, 439
Aistleitner, J. 41, 59, 64, 65, 68, 93, 101, 102, 139, 233, 237, 240, 251, 255, 256, 264, 274, 280, 311, 315, 321-23, 328, 341-45, 365, 368
Aitken, K.T. 254, 264, 287
Albright, W.F. 83, 111, 115, 135, 176, 188, 189, 196, 250, 267, 273, 274, 356
Allan, R. 327, 336
Annus, A. 317, 433
Arnaud, D. 337
Astour, M.C. 70-72, 77, 122, 125, 153, 154, 189, 193, 200, 247, 337, 339, 343, 344, 376, 379-82, 384, 385, 391-93, 396
Avishur, Y. 67, 88, 109, 138, 363-65, 389, 395, 396, 421, 422, 442-45, 447, 449

Badre, L. 188
Baigent, M. 297
Barr, J. 79
Barr, M.L. 381
Barton, T. 297
Batto, B.F. 79, 80
Bauer, H. 13, 46
Becking, B. 232, 349, 361, 362
Belmonte, J.A. 385
Bernhardt, K.-H. 176, 177, 191-94, 209, 225, 238, 240
Binger, T. 83, 140, 361
Boda, M.J. 255, 256, 258
Bordreuil, P. 9, 10, 21, 35, 64, 65, 140, 146, 220, 284, 333, 379, 402, 417, 420, 431, 432, 434-47
Boreux, C. 54
Borger, R. 395
Bowman, C.H. 380, 385
Boyd, J.L., III 200, 422
Breasted, J.H. 332
Brueggemann, W. 64

Caquot, A. 40-44, 48, 55, 57, 59, 60, 62-64, 67, 68, 70-74, 77, 83, 85-89, 91-96, 98, 102, 104, 107, 109-12, 115, 116, 118, 119, 122-28, 130, 138-40, 144, 145, 156-69, 171-73, 193, 250-52, 254-62, 264, 266, 268, 269, 271-74, 280, 282-84, 287-95, 297-99, 301, 315-23, 325, 327, 328, 330, 333, 334, 337, 339-45, 368-70, 372, 374, 376, 379, 380, 384, 385, 397, 405, 406, 407, 413, 423, 431-40, 442-49
Cartledge, T.W. 200, 201
Cassuto, U. 86, 104, 110, 148, 180-82, 189, 298
Cathcart, K. 134, 405-13
Caubet, A. 309
Cazelles, H. 169, 171, 172, 273
Cecchini, S.M. 439
Charlesworth, J.H. 117
Chenet, G. 70
Clemens, D.M. 396
Clifford, R.J. 46, 432
Cohen, M.E. 367
Coogan, M.D. 41, 179, 182
Cooper, A. 266, 287-93, 302, 395
Coote, R.B. 380, 385
Craigie, P.C. 132
Cunchillos, J.-L. 181, 440
Cutler, J. 324, 326, 391

Dahood, M.J. 63, 71, 216, 238, 296
Dalix, A.S. 21
Dalley, S. 145, 432
Davies, P.R. 361
Day, J. 79, 80, 109, 115, 132, 361, 362, 368, 389
Day, P.L. 155, 173
Deimel, A. 72
Delcor, M. 158
Dhorme, E. 364
Dietrich, M. 35, 70, 87, 117, 118, 130, 143, 146, 180, 182, 185, 189-92, 219, 253, 259, 283, 285, 290, 342-44, 357, 358, 363-66, 372, 379, 380, 385, 392, 395-98, 400, 404-406, 424, 431-33, 436, 437, 440, 441, 443
Dijkstra, M. 86, 89, 140, 208, 251, 252, 255-61, 266, 268, 271, 274, 279, 284, 285, 289-95, 298-301, 306, 310-12, 321, 324, 351, 370, 371, 372-74, 421
Dressler, H.H.P. 134, 208, 251, 260, 279, 280
Driver, G.R. 41, 43, 55, 57, 59, 60, 65, 68, 73, 77, 85, 88, 89, 91, 93-95, 101, 102, 115, 122, 124, 138-40, 145, 163, 165-67, 182, 186, 188, 189, 191, 195, 196, 197, 201, 213-15, 228, 232, 233, 237, 240, 250, 251, 254, 264, 269-71, 274, 280, 284, 285, 287, 288, 290, 292, 293, 300, 327, 328, 330, 338, 339, 390
Duerbeck, H.W. 366, 367
Dupont-Sommer, A. 421
Durand, J.-M. 35, 65, 110, 220, 344, 363
Dussaud, R. 71, 124, 137, 164

Eissfeldt, O. 193, 258, 259
Emerton, J.A. 115, 116, 132, 192
Engnell, I. 176
Epzstein, L. 185

Fales, F.M. 191
Faulkner, R.O. 190, 197, 375
Fensham, F.C. 138, 389
Fenton, T.L. 404
Finkel, J. 182, 192
Finkelstein, J.J. 433
Fisher, L.R. 388-90
Fleming, D.E. 21, 146, 189, 442-47
Fontenrose, J.A. 35
Ford, J.N. 375
Forsyth, N. 35
Frankfort, H. 210, 224
Freilich, D. 146, 345
Friedman, R.E. 404
Fulco, W.J. 362

Gadd, C.J. 210
Gallagher, W.R. 337, 340, 378
Garbini, G. 272
Gaster, T.H. 35, 80, 91, 101, 102, 110-12, 115, 123, 133, 138, 140, 162, 164-67, 190, 264, 268, 269, 273, 279, 280, 287, 290, 298, 308, 310, 312, 326-30, 378
Gehman, H.S. 122
Gevirtz, S. 222, 223
Gibson, J.C.L. 10, 41, 42, 45-47, 49, 50, 53-55, 57, 59, 63-65, 67, 68, 70, 72, 74, 77, 83, 85-89, 91, 93-95, 98, 101, 102, 105, 107, 109, 112, 115, 116, 118, 122-25, 127, 128, 132, 135, 137-40, 143-45, 158, 176, 180, 182, 184, 185, 189, 191, 193, 194, 196, 197, 201, 206, 207, 210, 213, 214, 216, 218, 219, 221, 224-33, 236, 238, 240, 250, 251, 254, 255, 258, 259, 261, 264, 268, 269, 273, 274, 280, 283-85, 288, 290, 292, 293, 297-301, 311, 312, 323, 327, 328, 330, 333, 339, 397
Gimbutas, M. 186
Ginsberg, H.L. 41, 42, 57, 59, 60, 64, 67, 68, 71, 87, 91, 93, 125, 130, 135, 137, 138, 158, 159, 162, 164-67, 176, 180, 181, 183-86, 188-91, 193-97, 204, 206, 207, 209, 210, 213-21, 223-26, 228, 230, 233, 234, 236, 237, 240, 263, 264, 275, 296, 326-30, 336, 340
Goetze, A. 338

Good, E.M. 274
Good, R.M. 65, 81, 98, 124, 143, 396, 432
Gopher, A. 70
Gordon, C.H. 41, 94, 115, 141, 157, 160, 162, 166, 167, 170, 171, 180, 187, 189, 196, 200, 215, 218, 280, 287, 339, 343, 344, 368, 411
Grabbe, L. 35, 206, 216
Graves, R. 70, 115
Gray, J. 122, 132, 139, 164-67, 176, 180, 182, 184, 185, 187-89, 191, 193-97, 207-209, 212-17, 219, 225, 226, 228, 231, 233, 236, 237, 329, 385
Greaves, S.W. 386
Greenfield, J. 183
Greenstein, E.L. 176
Gruber, M. 40
Gulde, S. 324
Gurney, O.R. 362

Hallo, W.W. 21
Halpern, B. 404
Handy, L.K. 86, 131, 206, 287, 361, 362
Harbison, P. 106
Harrison, J. 71
Hayman, A.P. 85
Healey, J.F. 144, 237, 255, 259, 360, 361, 398, 429-37, 439
Heider, G.C. 422
Held, M. 188
Heltzer, M. 322
Hendel, R.S. 198
Herdner, A. 148, 185, 186, 188-94, 196, 197, 200, 201, 210, 213, 215, 217, 219-21, 223-26, 228, 229, 231-33, 235-37, 240, 273, 291, 329, 338, 416, 418, 420-22
Herrmann, W. 338, 361, 370, 371, 374, 443
Hettema, T.L. 325, 328-30, 333
Hoffmeier, J.K. 402
Hoffner, H.A. 93
Hoftijzer, J. 139, 284
Holloway, S. 363
Huffmon, H.B. 362
Husser, J.-M. 10, 118, 144, 191, 250-52, 257, 258, 262, 264, 265, 433
Hvidberg, F.F. 135, 138, 139

Jackson, J.J. 208, 260
Jacobsen, T. 41
Jaynes, J. 197, 207, 238
Jeffers, A. 146, 447
Jirku, A. 41, 57, 59, 68, 102, 111, 225, 237, 250-52, 254-56, 264, 274, 280, 287, 311, 341
Johnstone, W. 138, 385, 386
Jong, T. De 356, 366, 367, 416
Jongeling, K. 139

Kapelrud, A.S. 162, 163, 166, 167
Kemp, B.J. 402
Kestemont, G. 180
Kitchen, K.A. 399, 401-403, 430, 433
Klengel, H. 35, 400
Knutson, F.B. 388-90
Koch, K. 259
Korpel, M.C.A. 57, 232, 349
Kottsieper, I. 384
Kruger, P. 126
Kuhrt, A. 400

Lambert, W.G. 41, 381
Landsberger, B. 167
Largement, R. 327
Laroche, E. 428
Leclant, J. 378
Leibovitch, J. 54
Lévi-Strauss, C. 106, 242, 376
Levine, B.A. 21, 106, 107, 137, 144, 170, 212, 348-54, 358, 378, 379, 381, 386, 391, 393, 394, 430-41
Lewis, T.J. 35, 115, 116, 315-317, 318, 320-24, 404, 432-39
L'Heureux, C. 315-18, 320, 322, 323, 397, 433
Lichtheim, M. 136
Lipiński, E. 156, 376, 384, 388, 432, 433
Liverani, M. 399, 400, 411
Livingstone, A. 432
Lloyd, J.B. 10, 50, 73-75, 103, 156-58, 161, 169-72, 322, 376

Loewenstamm, S.E. 66, 96, 129, 135, 260, 327, 405, 407, 413
L'Orange, H.P. 86, 239
Loretz, O. 70, 87, 101, 117, 118, 130, 138, 143, 146, 180, 182, 185, 189-92, 219, 253, 259, 283, 285, 290, 342-44, 357, 358, 363-66, 372, 379, 380, 385, 392, 395, 396-98, 400, 404-406, 424, 431-33, 436, 437, 440, 441, 443, 448

Macdonald, J. 324, 326, 391
Macintosh, A.A. 68
Malamat, A. 431
Malbran-Labat, F. 146
Mallet, J. 404
Mallowan, M. 186
Malul, M. 93
Marcus, D. 129, 336
Margalit, B. 23, 67, 71, 79, 91-96, 104, 105, 109-12, 115-20, 125, 127, 128, 130, 132, 133, 137-40, 156, 177, 179-81, 182, 192, 193, 195, 197, 202, 205-208, 213, 215-19, 223-25, 228, 232, 234, 236, 242, 243, 247, 249-55, 256, 258-61, 263, 264, 266-71, 273, 274, 276, 280-89, 291-95, 297, 298, 300-303, 305-308, 310-12, 337-39, 360, 370-72, 388, 389, 395, 396, 398, 405, 407-13, 422, 431, 446
Mayer, W.R. 110
Mayer-Opificius, R. 92, 438
Mazzini, G. 136
McBride, S.D. 198
McCurley, F.R. 68
McKenna, T. 187
McLeod, W. 267
Meier, S. 34, 37, 51
Mellaart, J. 186
Mendenhall, G.E. 267
Merrill, A.L. 168, 176, 177, 180, 232
Mesnil du Buisson, R. du 200
Metzger, M. 92
Milgrom, J. 419
Milik, J.T. 71
Millard, A.R. 433
Miller, P.D. 215
Mironov, N.D. 410
Mithen, S. 131
Montgomery, J.A. 122, 125
Moor, J.C. de 34, 35, 40-46, 48-51, 53-57, 59, 60, 62-65, 67, 68, 70-74, 77, 78, 80, 83, 84-89, 93-95, 98, 101, 102, 104, 105, 107, 109-12, 116-18, 120, 122-25, 127-30, 133, 135, 137, 138-41, 143-45, 155-67, 169-73, 179-88, 188-97, 200, 201, 206-21, 223-29, 231-35, 237, 240, 242, 247, 250, 252, 255-61, 264, 266, 268, 269, 271, 274, 279-85, 288-95, 297-301, 306, 308-12, 315-17, 319-23, 325, 326, 328-31, 333, 334, 336, 337-39, 341-43, 346, 348-54, 357-60, 368-73, 376, 379-81, 385-90, 392, 396-98, 405-408, 410-13, 416-24, 428-32, 434, 435, 437, 442-49
Moore, M.S. 327
Morgan, L. 89
Moscati, S. 357
Mowinckel, S. 176
Mussies, G. 122

Neiman, D. 115, 330
Neu, E. 275
Noori, K.A. al 57
Noth, M. 345
Nougayrol, J. 208, 261, 357, 360-62, 364, 375, 402, 440

Obermann, J. 68, 252, 363, 364
O'Callaghan, R.T. 46, 140
O'Flaherty, W.D. 378
Oldenburg, U. 51, 242, 368, 405
Olivier, J.P. 356, 367
Olmo Lete, G. del 34, 40-42, 45-47, 49, 53-60, 63-65, 67, 68, 70-74, 77, 79, 85, 86, 88, 89, 91-96, 98, 101, 102, 105, 109-11, 115-19, 123, 125, 127, 128, 130, 133, 136-40, 144-46, 157, 158, 160, 162-67, 169-72, 179-83, 185, 188-96, 207-10, 213, 215, 216, 218, 219, 221, 223-29, 231-33, 236-38, 240,

242, 250, 251, 254-56, 258, 259, 261, 264, 267, 271, 274, 280, 283, 284, 285, 287-93, 295, 297-301, 303, 306, 310-12, 315-23, 325-29, 330, 331, 333, 337, 339, 341-43, 345, 348-51, 353, 354, 356-58, 360, 362-65, 371, 372, 375, 376, 379, 385, 391-93, 395-97, 400, 417-21, 424, 428, 429, 432-35, 437, 439, 440, 442-45, 448
Olrik, A. 258

Page, H.R., Jr 133
Pardee, D. 10, 14, 21, 34, 35, 40-43, 45, 51, 54, 55, 58, 59, 61, 63-65, 68, 70, 72, 74-76, 79-81, 83, 85-87, 92, 93, 107, 110, 111, 115, 117, 124, 127, 130, 132, 136, 138, 140, 145, 146, 179, 180, 189, 190, 193, 202, 208, 209, 219, 251, 252, 256, 257, 259-61, 264, 266, 267, 269, 272-74, 277-80, 283-87, 289, 291, 292, 294-300, 303, 304, 306, 307, 309, 311, 312, 321, 324-32, 337, 340, 342, 343, 346, 348, 351, 354, 356-61, 363, 366, 367, 378-80, 384-86, 389-93, 395-402, 404-406, 408-13, 417-24, 426, 427, 429-41, 443-45, 448, 449
Parker, S.B. 162, 177, 179, 180, 201, 221, 222, 227, 235, 242, 243, 246, 247, 250, 260, 262, 264, 266, 268, 368, 378, 385, 395
Parpola, S. 267
Patai, R. 352
Paul, S. 104
Pedersen, J. 197
Petersen, D.L. 36, 140
Petrie, W.M.F. 98
Pitard, W.T. 124, 306, 315, 316, 321, 368, 369, 430-41
Plöchl, R. 185
Pope, M.H. 46, 51, 159, 219, 256, 375, 389, 405-407, 409-11, 413, 430, 432, 434, 437
Porter, J.R. 324
Puech, E. 357, 362

Rabe, N. 115
Rainey, A.F. 274, 352
Ratner, R. 328
Reiter, K. 66, 185, 285
Renfroe, F. 46, 116, 118, 140, 144, 160, 165, 187, 189, 272, 274, 288, 298, 323, 388, 398
Richardson, M.E.J. 15, 136, 193
Riley, G.J. 277
Rin, S. 57, 161
Ritner, R.K. 370
Rosenthal, F. 194
Rothenberg, B. 386
Rouillard, H. 250
Rütersworden, U. 384

Saad, G. 74, 400
Sanders, P. 342, 343, 345, 346
Sanmartin, J. 117, 118, 237, 342-44, 351, 357, 358, 363-66, 392, 396, 397, 405, 406
Saracino, F. 443-45, 448, 449
Sarna, N. 213
Sasson, J.M. 145, 146, 182
Sauren, H. 180
Sawyer, J.F.A. 366, 367
Schaeffer, C.F.-A. 13, 188, 208, 417
Schmidt, B.B. 144, 210, 361, 399-401, 423, 431-34, 437-40
Schwemer, D. 41
Seitter, W.C. 366, 367
Selms, A. van 34, 57, 62, 68, 91, 93, 116, 181, 337, 342-44
Seters, J. van 258
Singer, I. 400, 440
Smith, G.A. 156, 250
Smith, J.Z. 76
Smith, M.S. 23, 34, 35, 40-45, 47-59, 61-68, 101, 104, 152, 155, 158, 161, 362, 375, 426
Soldt, W.H. van 146, 356, 366, 367, 416
Spalinger, A.J. 422
Sperling, S.D. 447
Spronk, K. 117, 130, 144, 179, 181-88, 190-95, 198, 200, 201, 206, 207, 209, 210, 213-15, 217-19, 224, 226, 229, 232-34, 266, 274,

276, 281-83, 288, 300, 316, 321, 322, 358, 368, 408, 410, 411, 417, 422, 431, 434, 435, 440
Stephenson, F.R. 366, 367
Swerdlow, N. 366, 367
Swiggers, P. 13
Sznycer, M. 40-42, 44, 48, 55, 57, 59, 60, 62-64, 67, 68, 70-74, 77, 83, 85-89, 91-96, 98, 102, 104, 107, 109-12, 115, 116, 118, 119, 122-28, 130, 138-40, 144, 145, 156, 157, 159-68, 250-52, 254-56, 259-62, 264, 266, 268, 269, 271, 273, 274, 280, 282-84, 287, 289-95, 297-99, 301, 315-22, 325, 328, 334, 337

Tallqvist, K.L. 70
Tarragon, J.-M. de 21, 106, 107, 144, 170, 188, 212, 342-44, 348-54, 356-59, 378, 379, 381, 385, 386, 391, 393-97, 417-20, 428, 430-32, 433-41
Taylor, J.G. 432, 433, 435, 437, 438
Thompson, R.C. 412
Thomsen, M.-L. 376
Tigay, J.H. 389
Toorn, K. van der 71, 72, 112, 255, 256, 258, 360
Tromp, N.J. 113
Tropper, J. 65, 136, 180, 182, 183, 298, 330, 348, 442
Troy, L. 197
Trujillo, J.I. 325, 326
Tsevat, M. 112, 182, 221, 256, 327, 402
Tsuk, T. 70
Tsumura, D. 182, 326, 332
Tuell, S.S. 101, 371

Udd, S.V. 115

Vattioni, G. 211
Vawter, B. 58
Verreet, E. 432, 442
Vervenne, M. 185
Virolleaud, C. 13, 48, 52-55, 64, 71, 72, 74, 76, 122, 124, 132, 135, 138, 139, 144, 156-58, 165, 166, 179, 180, 188, 193, 200, 206, 207, 209, 213-15, 218, 219, 221, 223-26, 230, 232, 236, 238, 240, 246, 249, 250, 253, 254, 258, 261, 264, 266, 269, 271, 273, 274, 276, 280, 288-91, 293, 294, 298, 300, 301, 310, 315, 321-23, 325, 327-29, 333, 337, 339, 346, 366, 368, 371, 376, 380, 384, 385, 388, 395-97, 400, 405-409, 413
Vita, J.-P. 140, 185, 190

Walker, C.B.F. 366
Walls, N.H. 155, 156, 158, 170, 173, 361
Watson, W.G.E. 41, 43, 46, 59, 70, 74, 76, 79, 81, 83, 91, 98, 101, 110, 116, 124, 130, 134, 135, 139, 140, 145, 157, 161, 164, 179, 183, 187, 190-92, 194, 197, 198, 209, 210, 224, 226, 227, 233, 240, 251, 259, 272, 282, 285, 289, 292, 295-97, 303, 307, 310, 317, 321, 329, 332-34, 340, 341, 363, 375, 378, 387, 406, 407, 409, 411-13, 419, 421, 422, 444, 445, 446
Watts, J.W. 253
Weippert, M. 344
West, D.R. 80, 236, 373, 409
Westhuizen, J.P. van der 186
Whitaker, R.E. 58, 172, 330
Whitelam, K.W. 97
Whittle, A. 186
Whybray, R.N. 258
Wiggerman, F.A.M. 117, 125
Wiggins, S. 10, 83, 361, 362
Wilson, J.A. 136
Woodward, D.L. 36, 140
Wright, D.P. 246
Wright, R.M. 286
Wyatt, N. 35, 36, 39-42, 44-46, 48-50, 52, 53, 57-60, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68, 75, 77, 78, 83, 85, 89, 97, 99, 101, 108, 110-12, 122, 124, 125, 126, 128, 131-33, 138, 140, 145, 146, 158, 160, 162, 163, 166, 170, 172, 177, 182, 184, 185, 198, 206,

209, 210, 213, 219-22, 227, 231, 238, 239, 242, 243, 246, 255, 259, 261, 267, 278, 324, 326, 327, 330, 333, 336, 337, 340, 349, 361-63, 369, 385, 387, 389, 398, 399, 402, 410, 432, 433, 436, 441

Xella, P. 41, 68, 70, 93, 102, 124, 180, 182-86, 188-92, 196-98, 200, 201, 215, 219, 223-25, 228, 233, 237, 240, 248, 251, 254, 255, 256-58, 268, 269, 274, 279, 280, 287, 300, 311, 325, 328, 329, 342, 343, 345, 348-54, 356-59, 361-66, 379, 384, 388, 390-93, 400, 411-13, 416-19, 421, 422, 424, 425, 427, 429-33, 438, 443, 448

Yadin, Y. 267
Yon, M. 10, 92, 111, 208, 251, 255, 397, 404, 432

Young, D.W. 385
Younger, K.L. 21

Zijl, P.J. van 62, 143
Zuckerman, B. 328

THE BIBLICAL SEMINAR

1 John W. Rogerson, *Anthropology and the Old Testament*
2 Athalya Brenner, *The Israelite Woman: Social Role and Literary Type in Biblical Narrative*
3 J.H. Eaton, *Kingship and the Psalms*
4 Mark Kiley, *Colossians as Pseudepigraphy*
5 Niels Peter Lemche, *Ancient Israel: A New History of Israelite Society*
6 J. Høgenhaven, *Problems and Prospects of Old Testament Theology*
7 Benedikt Otzen, *Judaism in Antiquity: Political Developments and Religious Currents from Alexander to Hadrian*
8 Bruce D. Chilton, *God in Strength: Jesus' Announcement of the Kingdom*
9 Albrecht Alt, *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*
10 Jack M. Sasson, *Ruth: A New Translation with a Philological Commentary and a Formalist-Folklorist Interpretation (Second Edition)*
11 Douglas A. Knight (ed.), *Tradition and Theology in the Old Testament*
12 J.P. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art in Genesis: Specimens of Stylistic and Structural Analysis (Second Edition)*
13 Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, *Narrative Space and Mythic Meaning in Mark*
14 S. Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*
16 Dean W. Chapman, *The Orphan Gospel: Mark's Perspective on Jesus*
17 Larry J. Kreitzer, *The New Testament in Fiction and Film: On Reversing the Hermeneutical Flow*
18 Daniel C. Fredericks, *Coping with Transience: Ecclesiastes on Brevity in Life*
19 W.D. Davies, *Invitation to the New Testament: A Guide to its Main Witnesses*
20 Terence Collins, *The Mantle of Elijah: The Redaction Criticism of the Prophetical Books*
22 Cecil Hargreaves, *A Translator's Freedom: Modern English Bibles and their Language*
23 Karel van der Toorn, *From Her Cradle to Her Grave: The Role of Religion in the Life of the Israelite and the Babylonian Woman*
24 Larry J. Kreitzer, *The Old Testament in Fiction and Film: On Reversing the Hermeneutical Flow*
25 W.D. Davies, *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine*
26 Michael Prior, CM, *Jesus the Liberator: Nazareth Liberation Theology (Luke 4.16-30)*
27 Neil Elliott, *Liberating Paul: The Justice of God and the Politics of the Apostle*
28 Jane Schaberg, *The Illegitimacy of Jesus: A Feminist Theological Interpretation of the Infancy Narratives*
29 Volkmar Fritz, *The City in Ancient Israel*
30 Frank Moore Cross, Jr, *The Ancient Library of Qumran (Third Edition)*
31 Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter (eds.), *The Synoptic Gospels: A Sheffield Reader*

32 Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans (eds.), *The Johannine Writings: A Sheffield Reader*
33 Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter (eds.), *The Historical Jesus: A Sheffield Reader*
34 Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans (eds.), *The Pauline Writings: A Sheffield Reader*
35 Daniel Smith-Christopher (ed.), *Text and Experience: Towards a Cultural Exegesis of the Bible*
36 James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *Qumran Questions*
37 Andrew Parker, *Painfully Clear: The Parables of Jesus*
38 Stephen H. Smith, *A Lion With Wings: A Narrative-Critical Approach to Mark's Gospel*
39 John W. Rogerson (ed.), *The Pentateuch: A Sheffield Reader*
40 J. Cheryl Exum (ed.), *The Historical Books: A Sheffield Reader*
41 David J.A. Clines (ed.), *The Poetical Books: A Sheffield Reader*
42 Philip R. Davies (ed.), *The Prophets: A Sheffield Reader*
43 Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter (eds.), *New Testament Backgrounds: A Sheffield Reader*
44 Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans (eds.), *New Testament Text and Language: A Sheffield Reader*
45 Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans (eds.), *New Testament Interpretation and Methods: A Sheffield Reader*
46 Michel Desjardins, *Peace, Violence and the New Testament*
47 David J. Chalcraft (ed.), *Social-Scientific Old Testament Criticism: A Sheffield Reader*
48 Michael Prior, CM, *The Bible and Colonialism: A Moral Critique*
49 Alexander Rofé, *Introduction to the Prophetic Literature*
50 Kirsten Nielsen, *Satan—The Prodigal Son? A Family Problem in the Bible*
51 David J.A. Clines, *The Bible and the Modern World*
52 Robert Goldenberg, *The Nations that Know Thee Not: Ancient Jewish Attitudes towards Other Religions*
53 N. Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit: The Words of Ilimilku and his Colleagues*
54 Luis Alonso Schökel, *A Manual of Hermeneutics*
55 Detlev Dortmeyer, *The New Testament among the Writings of Antiquity*
57 Louis Stulman, *Order amid Chaos: Jeremiah as Symbolic Tapestry*
58 Alexander Rofé, *Introduction to the Composition of the Pentateuch*
59 James W. Watts, *Reading Law: The Rhetorical Shaping of the Pentateuch*
60 Yairah Amit, *History and Ideology: Introduction to Historiography in the Hebrew Bible*
61 Larry J. Kreitzer, *Pauline Images in Fiction and Film: On Reversing the Hermeneutical Flow*
62 Sandra Hack Polaski, *Paul and the Discourse of Power*
64 R.S. Sugirtharajah, *Asian Biblical Hermeneutics and Postcolonialism: Contesting the Interpretations*

65 Harold C. Washington, Susan Lochrie Graham and Pamela Thimmes (eds.), *Escaping Eden: New Feminist Perspectives on the Bible*
66 Norman K. Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh*
67 Alec Gilmore, *A Dictionary of the English Bible and its Origins*
68 Roman Garrison, *Why are you Silent, Lord?*
69 Allan Millard, *Reading and Writing in the Time of Jesus*
70 Ferdinand E. Deist, *The Material Culture of the Bible: An Introduction* (edited with a preface by Robert P. Carroll)
71 Tod Linafelt (ed.), *Strange Fire: Reading the Bible after the Holocaust*
72 Edwin D. Freed, *The Stories of Jesus' Birth: A Critical Introduction*
73 M.E.J. Richardson, *Hammurabi's Laws: Text, Translation and Glossary*
74 Larry J. Kreitzer and Deborah W. Rooke (eds.), *Ciphers in the Sand: Interpretations of The Woman Taken in Adultery (John 7.53–8.11)*
75 Arthur Gibson, *Biblical Semantic Logic: A Preliminary Analysis*
76 Peter J. Tomson, *If this be from Heaven: Jesus and the New Testament Authors in their Relationship to Judaism*
77 Bob Becking, Meindert Dijkstra, Marjo Korpel and Karel Vriezen, *Only One God? Monotheism in Ancient Israel and the Veneration of the Goddess Asherah*
78 Francis Schmidt, *How the Temple Thinks: Identity and Social Cohesion in Ancient Judaism*
79 Dan Cohn-Sherbok and John M. Court (eds.), *Religious Diversity in the Graeco-Roman World: A Survey of Recent Scholarship*
80 Mark Goodacre, *The Synoptic Problem: A Way Through the Maze*
81 Philip R. Davies (ed.), *First Person: Essays in Biblical Autobiography*
83 K.L. Noll, *Canaan and Israel in Antiquity: An Introduction*
84 Larry J. Kreitzer, *Gospel Images in Fiction and Film: On Reversing the Hermeneutical Flow*
85 Nicolas Wyatt, *Space and Time in the Religious Life of the Ancient Near East*
86 Mary Ann Beavis (ed.), *The Lost Coin: Parables of Women, Work and Wisdom*